

## **Gott und die Gier.** **Altorientalisch-alttestamentliche Erkundungen** **eines aktuellen Begriffs \***

### I. Zur historisch-theologischen Tiefenschärfe des Gier-Begriffs

Die Rede von der Gier hat Konjunktur im gegenwärtigen finanzkapitalistischen Krisendiskurs und scheint mitunter zu einer quasi-diagnostischen Kategorie geworden zu sein. Sie fungiert als pejorative Zuschreibung an Individuen oder Institutionen, kann aber andererseits auch als fast autonome Größe erscheinen. Unklar bleibt meist, ob es sich bei dem so benannten Phänomen um ein Moraledefizit einzelner oder um eine systemische Größe, gar um das *Movens* des Kapitalismus, handelt. Beides muss durch genaue ökonomische und sozialpsychologische Gegenwartsanalysen beantwortet werden <sup>1</sup>.

Da aber Erkennen und Handeln nicht im begriffs- und geschichtslosen Raum erfolgen, sind mittelbar auch die historischen Disziplinen herausgefordert. Für die Rede von der Gier gilt dies um so mehr, da sie als (über)individuelle Größe im sozio-ökonomischen Diskurs eine lange Geschichte aufweist. Weit über die, mittelalterlicher Moral entlehnte, volkstümliche Bannung als sog. Todsünde <sup>2</sup>, wurzelt die Gier-Zuschreibung nicht nur in der Bibel, sondern reicht bis in die Welt des Alten Orients. Durch die Zeiten zeigt sie thematische und sprachliche Konstanz und signifikante Transformationen, denen die folgenden Überlegungen nachgehen.

Gilt die Gier als autonome Größe bzw. als Wesen des Systems, so liegt die rhetorische Figur der Prosopöie zugrunde. Sie gibt dem, was neutral als Ding, Struktur oder Prozess gilt, sprachlich und konzeptuell

---

\* Klaus Wengst zum 70. Geburtstag.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. hierzu H. WELZER, *Mentale Infrastrukturen*. Wie das Wachstum in die Welt und in die Seelen kam (Berlin 2011) sowie R. MIGGELBRINK, *Lebensfülle*. Für die Wiederentdeckung einer theologischen Kategorie (QD 235; Freiburg i. Br. 2009).

<sup>2</sup> Präziser wäre sie als Laster, bzw. als Haupt- oder Wurzelsünde bezeichnet cf. H. KRAMER, "Habgier", <sup>3</sup>*LThK* IV, 1127-1128.

tionell buchstäblich ein Gesicht. Exegese und Religionswissenschaft beschreiben dieses Personalisieren von Naturkräften und Strukturen als Grundzug des Mythos<sup>3</sup>. Die Funktion ist wiederum doppelgesichtig, jedenfalls wird sie unterschiedlich akzentuiert. So betont man, sie bann das Chaotisch-Unverständene in anthropomorphen Sozial- und Personalstrukturen, mache es verstehbar und (partiell) manipulierbar<sup>4</sup>. Dieses Ordnen durch ein Netz personaler Beziehungen, das über das sonst Ungedeutete bzw. Undeutbare geworfen wird, hat aber als Systematisierung auch totalisierende Züge. Es tendiert dahin, das Gedeutete in der Zuschreibung der (Über)Macht zu rechtfertigen. Auch liegt es nah, die bildspendenden Sozial-, Familien- und Genderstrukturen zu hypostasieren. Zugleich aber kann Personalisierung ein Akt der Humanisierung sein, da der Mensch machtvolle Größen nach dem Maß der eigenen Personalität versteht, womit ein "Protest gegen die Kontingenz" laut wird<sup>5</sup>.

Realmetaphorische Zuschreibungen ungezügelter Nahrungsaufnahme sind stehende Wendungen gegenwärtiger Gier-Diskurse (den Hals nicht vollkriegen können). Gieriges Schlingen mit unersättlichem Rachen bebildert hier wirtschaftlich-akkumulative Maßlosigkeit. Dieses Cluster nun findet sich in verblüffender, sprachlich-konzeptioneller Nähe auch in altorientalischen Quellen, besonders im ugaritischen Baalszyklus. Es charakterisiert dort, wie St. Guldes Studie "Der Tod als Herrscher in Ugarit und Israel" zeigt<sup>6</sup>, den Dürre- und Todesgott Mot, dessen Charakterisierung das Giermotiv des Alten Testaments

<sup>3</sup> Zur Religionsförmigkeit des Kapitalismus cf. W. BENJAMIN, *Gesammelte Schriften* VI (eds. R. TIEDEMANN – H. SCHWEPPEHÄUSER) (Frankfurt a. M. 1991) 100-102.

<sup>4</sup> Der Begriff Chaos (cf. χάσσω – gähnen) hat selbst mythisch-etymologische Bezüge zur Gier. Die primordiale Doppelfunktion der Chaosbannung und -integration belegt Hesiod, der das Chaos als das allererste Geschaffene fasst (ἦτοι μὲν πρώτιστα χάος γένετ' [Hesiod, *theog.* 120]), das "in die Ordnung [hineinragt]", J. EBACH, "Gott und Chaos. Die Schöpfung im Werden", *Begegnungen mit dem Chaos* (eds. V. GORGÉ – R. MOSER) (Bern 1995) 13-36, 17-18. Diese Dialektik blendet St. U. GULDE, *Der Tod als Herrscher in Ugarit und Israel* (FAT NF 2.22; Tübingen 2009) 115, n. 145, ab, die gegen CHR. AUFFAHR, "Chaos", *HWtG* II, 193-195, betont, wegen der system-notwendigen Lebensfunktion zähle der ugaritische Todesgott Mot nicht zur Chaos-Sphäre.

<sup>5</sup> C.-F. GEYER, *Mythos. Formen - Beispiele - Deutungen* (Beck'sche Reihe 2032; München 1996) 48.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. GULDE, *Tod*, 117.

aufnimmt und das von Jes 25,7-9 her bis zur Hoffnung auf die Verschlingung des Todes in 1 Kor 15,26 reicht <sup>7</sup>.

Die folgenden Erwägungen gehen den ugaritischen Vorlagen des Motivs und der alttestamentlichen Rezeption in Aufnahme und Kritik o.g. Studie nach. Im punktuellen Vergleich soll selbstredend nicht die ugaritische Kultur und Religion gegenüber der biblischen Reformulierung des Motivs abgewertet werden. Im Sinne religions- und begriffsgeschichtlicher Vertiefung werden vielmehr theologische und sozialetische Akzentverschiebungen nachgezeichnet.

## II. Die Gier, der Tod und die Götter — Der Baalsmythos und die Grenzen des Wachstums

Das 1928 entdeckte spätbronzezeitliche Ugarit und die dort gefundenen Texte bieten tiefe Einblicke in die kulturelle und religiöse Welt Kanaans <sup>8</sup>. Auch der biblischen Rede von der Gier geben sie religionsgeschichtliche Tiefenschärfe <sup>9</sup>. Der hierzu einschlägige, aus älteren Einzelmythen und -motiven zur Stadt-, Götter- und Naturgeschichte kompilierte Baals-Zyklus betont als Konflikterzählung diverser Götter die königliche Stellung des Wetter- und Stadtgottes Baal. Dabei spiegeln seine Figur und die Ereignisse um sie eher theopolitische Reflexionen des Stadtkönigtums, als die gelebte Religion oder einen Festkalender Ugarits <sup>10</sup>. Bei aller Diskus-

---

<sup>7</sup> Sachäquivalente Begriffsbildungen sind selten. Neben dem teils als Gier wiedergegebenen Hapaxlegomenon עִנְבָה (Ez 23,11) trägt הִרָה I Konnotationen negativen Begehrens (Spr 10,3; 11,6; Mi 7,3), steht aber bei umstrittener Zuordnung als הִרָה II auch resultativ für Unheil, Unfall und Unrecht (Ps 55,12). Cf. *DCH* II, 502-503; *HALAT* 227-228; <sup>18</sup>Ges, 271.

<sup>8</sup> Eine Übersetzung bietet M. DIETRICH – O. LORETZ (eds.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* [TUAT] III. 6. *Mythen und Epen* (Gütersloh 1997) IV, 1091-1199, ihr entstammen die folgenden Zitate.

<sup>9</sup> Zum Überblick: M. DIETRICH, "Ugarit", *RGK* VIII, 688-693; K.R. VEENHOF, *Geschichte des Alten Orients bis zur Zeit Alexander des Großen* (ATD.E 11; Göttingen 2001) 185; H. NIEHR, *Religionen in Israels Umwelt* (NEB.E 5; Würzburg 1998) 20-82; G. J. BROOKE – A. CURTIS, *Ugarit and the Bible* (UBL 11, Münster 1994).

<sup>10</sup> H. NIEHR, *Religionen*, 30-32; H. NIEHR – I. CORNELIUS, *Götter und Kulte in Ugarit. Kultur und Religion einer nordsyrischen Stadt in der Spätbronzezeit* (Mainz 2004) 40; M.S. SMITH, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle I* (VTS

sion über Zweck und Zusammengehörigkeit einzelner Aspekte aber bleiben die ökonomisch-ökologischen Grundlagen der Agrar- und Seehandelsstadt Ugarit greifbar <sup>11</sup>.

Die agrarische Dimension veranschaulicht der Konflikt Baals mit dem Dürre- und Todesgott Mot <sup>12</sup>. Er läuft darauf hinaus, dass nach Baals Niederlage und seiner Rettung und Rückkehr aus der Totenwelt ein Kampf entbrennt, in dem Mot zurückgedrängt, aber nicht besiegt werden kann (KTU 1.6 VI, 17-22). Am Ende steht ein Patt zwischen Lebens- und Todesmacht. Zwar sind die Dimensionen vielfältig, doch spiegeln die wechselnden Machtverhältnisse auch den jahreszeitlichen Wechsel vom durch verzehrende Dürre geprägten Sommer zum regenreich-fruchtbaren Winter <sup>13</sup>.

Wie angedeutet erscheinen Mot <sup>14</sup>, der Dürre-, Todes- und Unterweltgott und seine Aggression gegen Baal im Sprachbild des Schlingens und des gierig geöffneten Rachens. Bei aller historischen Distanz begegnet dabei das Gier-Motiv in einem bekannten Feld: Für seine im Folgenden skizzierte Beschreibung (KTU 1.5 I, 14-26 im Auszug) sind Begriffe wie Macht und Ökonomie, Wachstum, Tod und Natur(zerstörung) einschlägig.

Und die Kehle (*npš*) ist (wie) die Kehle des Löwen (15) der Öde (*thw*),  
oder die Gurgel (*brlt*) der Haie (16) im Meer  
oder (wie bei) einem Tümpel, den suchen (17) Büffel  
(oder wie bei) einer Quelle, die begehren Hindinnen.  
(18) Wenn wahrlich wahrlich meine Kehle (*npš*) verschlingt (*blt*)  
(19) einen Esel

---

55; Leiden 1994) 58-116; M.S. SMITH, "Interpreting the Baal Cycle", *UF* 18 (1986) 313-319; W. HERRMANN, "Baal", *DDD*, 132-139, 133.

<sup>11</sup> SMITH, *Cycle I*, 60-75.

<sup>12</sup> Zu Baal als Mittler der Fruchtbarkeit, cf. KTU 1.3 II 39-41; 1.4 6-7; 1.5 8; 1.16 III 5-7 und KTU 1.3 II 39; 1.6 III 6-7.12.-13. Zum sog. Sterben und Auferstehen Baals, cf. B.B. SMITH, "Baal (Deity)", *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* (Berlin 2011) I, 196-200, 197.

<sup>13</sup> Signifikanterweise markiert der Zyklus das Geschehen nicht als längst vergangen, wie die Mythen, die die Schöpfung in einem primordial-urzeitlichen Götterkampf verankern. M.S. SMITH – W. PITARD, *The Ugaritic Cycle II*. Introduction with Text Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4 (VTS 114; Leiden 2009) 45.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. J.F. HEALEY, "Mot מוֹת", *DDD*, 598-602.

Dann tatsächlich mit beiden Händen (20) will ich essen (*ilhm*)  
 wenn meine sieben Portionen (21) in der Schüssel sind,  
 wenn der Becher ein Gemisch (23) in Strömen.  
 So rufe mich nur Baal mit meinen Brüdern, es rufe Hadad mich nur  
 (24) mit meinem Gefolge um zu essen mit meinen Brüdern Brot  
 (25) um zu trinken mit meinen Brüdern Wein  
 (26) Vergaßest Du Ba'lu daß ich die vollends zermalmen kann  
 [Auslassung JDD]  
 (32) Ich! - Laß mich essen blutige Stücke von zwei Ellen Größe  
 Du mögest hinuntergehen in die Kehle des Sohnes Ilus Mot, in den  
 Schlund des Lieblings Ilus, des Gzr <sup>15</sup>.

Das Gier-Motiv in Mots Rede an Baal ist dreifach entfaltet: Gerahmt durch das Gier-Organ der Kehle <sup>16</sup> wird diese mit Haltungen als bedrohlich (Löwe, Hai) oder durstig (Büffel, Antilope) konnotierter Tiere verglichen; es folgen die schiere Größe bzw. der rohe Zustand der Gierobjekte, die die Maßlosigkeit des Hungers ausdrücken und schließlich verzerrtes menschliches Essen und Trinken. Der Mythos zeigt Mots Vernichtungskraft als orale Einverleibung von Leben und Welt und als Kontrollverlust, der ohne Sättigungsgefühl in alle Richtungen um sich greift. Mot ist mit der Gier als prägender Haltung nahezu identisch; er ist der Lebensfeind <sup>17</sup>. Ganz ähnlich werden in einem verwandten Ritualtext (KTU 1.23,61-64) gewisse Mot nahestehende Fresser-Gottheiten gezeichnet:

Sie setzen eine Lippe zur Erde, eine Lippe zum Himmel.  
 Und es gehen in ihren Mund die Vögel des Himmels  
 und die Fische des Meeres.  
 Sie stecken sich links und rechts in den Mund  
 aber satt werden sie nicht.

Der Mythos, der hier wie auch im verwandten Text KTU 1.5 II, 2-5 <sup>18</sup>, im himmelweit offenen Schlund die kosmisch-globale Dimension der Bedrohung ins Bild setzt, profiliert Mot und die Seinen in Gier, Schlingen und kosmisch entgrenzter Unersättlichkeit als unbesiegbare und tendenziell alles vernichtende (Über)Macht.

<sup>15</sup> Zur Übersetzung cf. DIETRICH – LORETZ, *Mythen*, 1174-1175. In KTU 1.5 I, 27-31 droht Mot Rache wegen Baals Sieg über den Meeressgott Yam an.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. H.W. WOLFF, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh <sup>6</sup>1994) 26-30.

<sup>17</sup> HEALEY, *Mot*, 599.

Dies spiegelt zweifellos Erfahrungen von sommerlichem Wassermangel, Hitze und Dürre, die Mensch, Flora und Fauna den Tod bringen können. Doch gewinnt Mōts zum überlebensgroßen Gier-subjekt personifizierte Macht ihr volles Profil erst, wenn man erkennt, dass sie mehr ist als mythische Meteorologie. Sie ist als todbringende Dürre agro-ökonomisch notwendig, denn so wichtig Regen und Potenz, also Baal, für die Vermehrung des Viehs und das Keimen der Saat sind, so unverzichtbar ist agrokulturell auch Mōts an sich lebensverzehrende Macht, da “ohne Dürre und Hitze [...] keine gute Ernte möglich [ist], da die Reifung zu langsam geht oder gar nicht einsetzt”<sup>19</sup>. Womöglich ist Mōt daher mitunter gar als Getreidegott charakterisiert<sup>20</sup>.

So begründet buchstäblich das Wachstum, dass sich Mōt und Baal nicht nur nicht besiegen können, sondern auch nicht dürfen (KTU 1.6 VI, 17-22): Am Ende des Mythos tritt die Sonnengöttin Schapschu auf. Sie tadelt Mōt, doch betont sie besonders, dass Mōt und Baal in jeweils zu respektierenden Beziehungen zum Göttervater Ilu stehen (KTU 1.6 VI, 22-32)<sup>21</sup>. Vor diesem höheren Forum wird die Pattsituation festlich besiegelt (KTU 1.6 VI, 33-44). Die Gegner erhalten zwei konzeptionell begrenzte, latent konkurrierende, sich (nur) temporal überlappende Machtsphären. Diese “wechselseitige Selbstbeschränkung” stabilisiert das Pantheon und entspricht ihrerseits “einer genauen kulturellen Wahl des Menschen [...], dessen existentielle Interessen in der religiösen Vorstellung einen Reflex finden”<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> Zitat nach GULDE, *Tod*, 100. Fast wortgleich formuliert KTU I.5,2-6: “[Eine Lippe zur Er]de /Scheol (...rs.) eine Lippe (*spt*) zum Himmel (*smm*), [er setzt] die Zunge zu den Sternen (*lkbkkm*). Er [sc. Baal, JDD] wird eintreten in sein Innerstes (*bkbdkh*), in seinen Mund geht er hinab (*yrd*) wie eine feuergetrocknete Olive, wie ein Produkt der Erde und die Frucht der Bäume. [...]” (GULDE, *Tod*, 89; DIETRICH – LORETZ, *Mythen*, 1176).

<sup>19</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 115.

<sup>20</sup> Hierauf weist womöglich Anats Sieg über Mōt, die ihn analog zum Ernten, Mahlen und Aussäen des Getreides behandelt (KTU 1.6 II 31-37; KTU 1.23,8ff, dazu NIEHR, *Religionen*, 35-36; HEALEY, *Mot*, 599). Trifft dies zu, wäre zu fragen, ob die Metaphorik des Todes als Saat, auf den Tod selbst gemünzt, schon sein Wiederaufkeimen, also Mōts Rückkehr impliziert.

<sup>21</sup> SMITH – PITARD, *Cycle II*, 53; H. NIEHR, “Zur Frage der Filiation des Gottes Ba'al in Ugarit”, *JNSL* 20 (1994) 165-177.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. P. XELLA, “Die ugaritische Religion. Methodologische und kul-

Dass Baal verschlungen und Mot nach Baals Rückkehr nicht vernichtet wird, wurde als mythologische Theodizee beschrieben. Sie rechtfertigt das lebensfeindliche der Welterfahrung darin, dass "[d]ie aus menschlicher Sicht bedrohlichen und lebensfreundlichen Mächte [...] miteinander und nebeneinander bestehen müssen"<sup>23</sup>. Personalisierte Gier und Tod sind als lebensfeindlich und naturnotwendig doppelt codiert. Das an sich Gierig-Unersättliche hat eine lebensdienliche Funktion und bleibt trotz dieser Funktion lebensfeindlich.

Dieses Konzept bietet nach M. Smith, seinen Anhängern "an integrated version of reality", da es die Chaosmächte Tod (und Meer) zu Faktoren eines göttlichen Familienstreits herabspielt<sup>24</sup>. Es kann, da es die ökonomisch grundierten Prinzipien von Leben und Sterben in den polytheistisch ausbalancierten Antagonismus zweier Götter und ihrer Machtsphären fasst<sup>25</sup>, als im Ansatz fatalistisch bzw. im Konnex mit der ugaritischen Königsideologie als systemstabilisierend bezeichnet werden.

Das zugrundeliegende Realitätsverständnis des Mythos spiegelt aber zugleich ein Wissen darum, dass das, was als natürliche Kraft in Leben und (agrarischer) Wirtschaft, "Wachstum" schafft, als sich in extenso ausdehnende "Natur"-Gewalt tödlich ist. Diese Einsicht ist entsprechend dem Strukturprinzip des Mythos personalisiert, sie hat aber auch inhaltlich Gewicht: Baal und Mot sind weder arbeitsteilig disponierende Kollegen noch neutrale Naturkräfte, sondern Todfeinde<sup>26</sup>. Die akkumulative Lebenskraft, die gegenwärtige ökonomische und soziobiologische Theorien zum autopoetisch-monistischen Konkurrenz-Prinzip ontologisieren<sup>27</sup>, ist im Mythos eine

---

turhistorische Betrachtungen", *Schnittpunkt Ugarit* (eds. M. KROPP – A. WAGNER) (Frankfurt a. M. 1999) 285-302.

<sup>23</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 93, n. 84.

<sup>24</sup> SMITH – PITARD, *Cycle II*, 53-55.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. KTU 1.6 VI 23-32 und KTU 1.2 III, 15-18, hierzu GULDE, *Tod*, 81-82.93-94; A. DA SILVA, "A Comparison of the Three-Leveled-World of the Old Testament Temple Building Narrative and the Three-Leveled-World of the House-Building Motif in Ugaritic Texts KTU 1.3 and 1.4", *Ugarit* (eds. G.J. BROOKE – A. CURTIS) 11-23, 17.

<sup>26</sup> Zu dieser Besonderheit des Baalsmythos, cf. GULDE, *Tod*, 82, n. 44 sowie T. METTINGER, *The Riddle of Resurrection. 'Dying and Rising Gods' in the Ancient Near East* (CBOT 50; Stockholm 2011) 270-271.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. R. DAWKINS, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford 1989) X. Zur Kritik des Homo-Oeconomicus-Theorems DUMOUCHEL, "Indifference and Envy. An Anthropological Analysis of Modern Economy", *Contagion* 10 (2003) 149-160, 151; MIGGELBRINK, *Lebensfülle*, 22-67.



durch lebensfreundliche Götter begrenzte Macht und das die Kräfte ausbalancierende Modell ist moralisch nicht neutral <sup>28</sup>.

Das im "Brennpunkt der ostmediterranen Weltwirtschaft" gelegene Ugarit <sup>29</sup>, das Anfang des 12. Jhdts. v. Chr., wohl im Zuge einer antiken Welthandelskrise unterging <sup>30</sup>, huldigte keinem Monotheismus des Wachstums.

### III. Gott, die Gierigen und die Opfer — Die sozialkritische Transformation des Giermotivs in der Hebräischen Bibel

Die religionsgeschichtliche Grundeinsicht, dass das alte Israel und sein Glaube im Horizont altorientalischer Religion und Kultur entstanden, und Jhwh und seinem Handeln altorientalische Götterrollen und mythische Einzelzüge anverwandelt wurden, bestätigt sich auch am Giermotiv <sup>31</sup>. Es findet sich im Alten Testament in Bildern des weit offenem Munds (פִּי), der Lipppen (שִׁפְתִּים) und des Rachens (נֶפֶשׁ) und besonders in der Wurzel des Schlingens (בָּלַע) <sup>32</sup>.

Die westsemitische Wurzel בָּלַע, die im Aramäischen, Jüdischen-Aramäisch, Syrischen, Äthiopischen und u.a. an den o.g. Stellen des ugaritischen Baalsmythos belegt ist <sup>33</sup>, findet sich im AT einschließlich des Namens Bela (Gen 14,2.8; 46,21; cf. 1 Chr 8,1.3; 36,32-33; cf. 1 Chr 1,43-44; Num 26,38.40; 1 Chr 5,8; 7,6) 65 mal. Sie zeigt in den Verbalstämmen ein klares Profil <sup>34</sup>: Im konkreten

<sup>28</sup> Die soziale Sensibilität der ugaritischen Kultur zeigt auch die Figur dn'īls in KTU 1.17-1.19. Cf. J.J. COLLINS, "Daniel", *DDD*, 219-220; J. DAY, "The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel", *VT* 30 (1980) 174-184.

<sup>29</sup> E.A. KNAUF, *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (NSKAT 29; Stuttgart 1994) 99.

<sup>30</sup> KNAUF, *Umwelt*, 64. Klassisch (cf. VEENHOF, *Geschichte*, 185) weist man Ugarits Ende den sog. Seevölkern zu; cf. DIETRICH, "Ugarit", 691.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. M.S. SMITH, *The Early History of God*. Yahweh and Other Deities in Ancient Israel (Grand Rapids, MI <sup>2</sup>2005).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. WOLFF, *Anthropologie*, 26-34.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Gesenius<sup>18</sup> I, 153. J. TROPPER, *Kleines Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache* (ELO 4; Göttingen 2008) 24, 149. J. AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-Historische Klasse; Berlin 1963) 49, 59, bietet auch das Nomen *brlt* bzw. *blt*, Appetit / Begehren.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. generell Gesenius<sup>18</sup>, 153; J. SCHÜPPHAUS, בָּלַע, *ThWAT* I, 658-661, 659.



Gebrauch geht es um die mit einer gewissen Schnelligkeit und Ungezügeltigkeit vollzogene (Jes 28,4) orale Einverleibung (cf. Ijob 7,19; 20,15)<sup>35</sup>. Subjekte sind Tiere (Jona 2,1), belebte bzw. personalisierte Natur (Ähren Gen 41,7.24; Schlange bzw. Stab Ex 7,12; Meerstiefe Ps 69,10; die Erde und ihr Schlund [נִפְשׁ] Jes 5,14; Hab 2,5b oder Mund [פִּי+אֶרֶץ] Num 16,30.32.34; 26,10; Ps 106,17; Dtn 11,6; Spr 1,12) und nicht zuletzt Menschen (Jer 28,4; Hos 8,7). Letztere sind im größten Teil der Belege explizites oder implizites Subjekt (2 Sam 17,16; 20,19; Pss 35,20; 52,6; 124,3 Klgl 2,2.5.8.16; Hab 1,13; Spr 1,12; 19,28; 20,21). Sächlicher Gebrauch markiert Jhwh oder eine ihm assoziierte Kraft (Ex 15,12 Ps 21,10; Ijob 2,3; Jes 19,3) als implizites Movens der Verschlingung (Ijob 2,3; 10,8).

Sachlich stehen erstens der Schling-Vorgang, zweitens der Effekt, das zum Verschwinden-Bringen oder -Gebracht-Sein im Fokus (cf. parallel zu שָׁחַת etwa in 2 Sam 20,20). Womöglich eignet בָּלַע drittens auch ein Aspekt der Nahrungskonkurrenz (Jes 28,4; Hos 8,7). Da Mund und Rachen auch Sprechorgane sind, werden viertens im figurativen Gebrauch (Pss 35,25-26; 52,6) konkrete Sprechakte monströs aufgeladen (vgl. Pss 35,16b.17b.20.21; 52,6). Fünftens ist, was Gulde im Verschlingen des Verschlingers als die singuläre Pointe von Jes 25,8-9 ausmacht<sup>36</sup>, m. E. auch sonst greifbar: die Inversion der Verschlingung, der die Gier-Subjekte selbst zum Opfer fallen (Ps 55,10<sup>37</sup>; Koh 10,12; Spr 19,28).

Das Gier-Motiv im AT wie es im Aufsperrn von Mund oder Lippen, Nicht-Satt-Werden, In-Sich-Hinein-Stopfen und im Verb, (ver)schlingen' (בָּלַע) vorliegt, zeigt hohe im Vergleich zum Gebrauch im Baalsmythos thematische Konstanz. Jedoch begegnen Tod und Gier im Horizont der monotheistischen Grunddynamik des Glaubens Israels nicht mehr als autonome göttliche Größen. Der personhaft gierige Todesgott ist zur שְׂאוּל 'versachlicht'<sup>38</sup>. Sie erbt

<sup>35</sup> Der Aspekt kurzer Dauer prägt die Redensart כְּבִלְעַת, die – cf. "a bit", "ein biss-chen" — sachlich "für in einem" bzw. "für einen Augenblick" steht (Num 4,20; [Ijob 7,19]).

<sup>36</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 154.

<sup>37</sup> Zu den Lesarten von V. 10a BHS sowie SCHÜPPHAUS, בָּלַע, 661; F. L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Psalms 51-100* (HThKAT; Freiburg 2000) 94; K. SEYBOLD, *Psalmen I* (HAT 15.1; Tübingen 1996) 221.

<sup>38</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 145-147. Als Folge ergibt sich umgekehrt eine latente Personalisierung der Scheol (ibid.)

im Verschlingen der Menschen Mots personale Attribute. Der Mund der Scheol ist als Spalt oder Riss des Erdbodens gedacht (Spr 1,12; Num 16,30-34; Ps 106,17; Dtn 11,6; Num 26,10-11; Jes 5,14).

Diese "Verschiebung" von "der Figur des Todes zum chthonischen Bereich der Unterwelt"<sup>39</sup>, dem eine Abspaltung der Todesfigur vom Raum entspreche, sieht Gulde in ihrem Exkurs zu Spr 1,12; 30,15; Pss 106,17; 124,3-4; 73,8-9; Numeri 16; Dtn 11,6 und Jes 5,14; 9,19 als Hauptdifferenz des alttestamentlichen zum ugaritischen Befund. Sie erwägt als Grund einen schöpfungstheologischen Akzent oder eine traditionsgeschichtliche Sonderform im südwestsemitischen Raum mit höherer Eigenständigkeit der Scheol gegenüber dem Tod<sup>40</sup>.

Doch beachtet Gulde, die besonders figurale Todes-Konzepte untersucht, m. E. zu wenig, dass Entpersonalisierung nur eine Seite der Transformation darstellt. Zwar notiert sie, das Motiv erhalte in der Übertragung auf Menschen im AT eine moralische Färbung<sup>41</sup>, doch hat dies kein eigenes analytisches Gewicht, sondern erscheint als eine strukturelle Folge religionsgeschichtlicher Verschiebungen ohne konkrete Anlässe. So ist beispielsweise Guldes These, im Gier- und Verschlingungsmotiv von Jes 9,19 tauche "weder der Aspekt der Strafe auf" noch würden "Menschengruppen aufgrund ihrer unmoralischen Kennzeichen verglichen"<sup>42</sup> nur haltbar, wenn die enge semantisch-motivische Verknüpfung von V. 19b zur Gerichtsansage an Israels Führer (cf. VV. 15.17 בלע / אכל) unbeachtet bleibt.

Bleiben bei Gulde der sozial-relationale Aspekt und die ökonomische Motivspitze in der Übertragung der Gier auf den Menschen unterbestimmt, indem sie einseitig als allgemeine Strukturkonsequenz religionsgeschichtlicher Transformation gelten, so ändert sich dies, wenn man die Motivkontexte fokussiert. Über isolierte Einzelverse hinaus tritt eine spezifisch sozialetische Transponierung hervor: Was einst Mot tat, adressiert in Tora, Psalter, Weisheit und Prophetie teils unter Bezug auf das schlingende Totenreich (Hab 2,5; Jes 5,14; 9,19; Ps 73,9; Spr 1,12; 30,14-15) konkrete Menschen(gruppen) mit konkretem sozio-ökonomischen Profil.

<sup>39</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 143 [erste Hervorhebung im Original, zweite JDD].

<sup>40</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 135-144, bes. 143.

<sup>41</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 156. Schon J. SCHÜPPHAUS, בלע, 661, betont בלע stehe im AT, wo "ein [...] Gerechte[r]" bedroht sei, auch drücke die Wurzel "[das] strafende [...] Einschreiten [...]" Gottes aus.

<sup>42</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 141.

Der folgende Gang durch die genannten und weitere Belege zeigt, dass die Gier ihren polytheistischen Überbau verliert, der o. g. theo-ökonomische Horizont aber erhalten bleibt. Das Gier-Motiv hat in der Bibel Israels durchaus neue personale Subjekte; es kritisiert deren Schlingen als Aneignen fremder Lebensmöglichkeiten.

(a) Dies zeigt etwa Jes 5,14, wo das Motiv eine Gerichtsansage verstärkt. In 5,11-17, dem zweiten der sechs Weherufe von 5,8-20 ist in V. 14 das Gericht als Aufsperrn der שפן<sup>43</sup> und des Mauls der Scheol konzipiert, es impliziert sachlich (hier ohne die Wurzel בלע) auch die Verschlingung. Kontextuell macht der doppelte Weheruf (5,8-12) die akkumulative ökonomische Praxis der Eliten als Gerichtsgrund deutlich (V. 13 לבן). Gericht und Tun der Gerichteten korrespondieren im semantischen Feld der Nahrungsaufnahme: Das einverleibende Schlingen der Scheol, entspricht ihrem orgiastischen Weinkonsum (VV. 11-12), wodurch der Text an die Anklagen des Weinbergliedes (5,1-7) rückgebunden wird<sup>44</sup>. Auch wenn das Gericht das Volk (V. 13abß) und Vornehme bzw. Reiche umfasst (VV. 13ba.15)<sup>45</sup>, liegt der Akzent auf der Korrespondenz zwischen dem Gerichtsmodus und dem Verhalten der Bestraften. Es gilt und entspricht der "Pracht Jerusalems"<sup>46</sup>, ihrem Lärm (V. 12) und beugt ihre Überheblichkeit (V. 15).

(b) Eine Analogie zwischen dem Gerichtsmodus und dem Tun der Gerichteten zeigt auch Jes 9,19-20<sup>47</sup>. Ein verzehrendes Feuer frisst (אכל) die, deren Unrecht lodert und die 'zur Rechten und Linken fressen' ohne satt zu werden (cf. KTU 1.23, 61-63) und die, das Fleisch ihres Arms' bzw. "ihres Nächsten fressen"<sup>48</sup>. Jes 9,11-12, eröffnet die zweite Strophe einer Komposition (9,7-11.16), die

<sup>43</sup> Cf. WOLFF, *Anthropologie*, 26.

<sup>44</sup> W.A.M. BEUKEN, *Jesaja 1-12* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br. 2003) 145. Cf. Jes 28,4.7, wo gieriges Schlingen mit dem Verschlingen-Sein-vom-Wein, also dem Alkoholrausch korreliert ist (Cf. Ps 107,27).

<sup>45</sup> Zur Textkritik von V. 13ba cf. BEUKEN, *Jesaja*, 143.

<sup>46</sup> V. 12 weist auf 2,10.19.21, wo Gottes Pracht den Prunk der Oberschicht (cf. 2,9.11; 2,14-17) kontrastiert.

<sup>47</sup> Stellt man 9,7-20 wegen der gleichen Kehrverse 5,25 und 9,20 zwischen 5,24.25, so J. BLENKINSOPP, *Isaiah 1-39* (AB 19; New York 2000) 217-219, rücken die Texte auch kompositorisch nah zusammen.

<sup>48</sup> Zur Textkritik cf. H. WILDENBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12* (BK X.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 206; BEUKEN, *Jesaja*, 261.

einen Nachklang zur Immanuelschrift bildet <sup>49</sup>. Die Strophe nennt die Verführer des Volkes, die es zu “dem Verschlungenwerden Ausgelieferten” (מבלעמים) gemacht hätten (V. 15) <sup>50</sup>. Von ersteren her (על-כן), dehnt sich das Gericht auf das ganze Volk aus (V.16). Eine Kongruenz im semantischen Feld zeigt sich neben בלע und אכל in VV. 17-20 auch im gottlos redenden Mund (V. 16), dem späteren Organ des Einverleibens (V. 19) und in V. 12, wo Syrer und Philister ‘Fress’ Feinde Israels sind. Dass weder “Strafe [...]” anklinge “noch einzelne Menschengruppen [...] aufgrund ihrer unmoralischen Kennzeichen” adressiert würden, lässt sich kaum sagen <sup>51</sup>. Vielmehr entsprechen sich Strafe (Feuerfraß אכל 17.18) und die selbstzerfleischenden (איש בשר-זרעו יאכלו V. 19b) Vergehen im Wortfeld der Nahrungsaufnahme (בלע V. 15 אכל V. 19). Auch unterscheidet die Komposition, wie u.a. die Folgeverse 10,1-4 zeigen, sehr wohl Verführer und Verführte, wenn auch Schuld und Gericht beide trifft. Wenn die vierte Strophe strukturelle Gewalt an den personae miserae thematisiert (10,1-4), beleuchtet rückwirkend diese soziale Unrechtssituation auch die Metaphorik der dritten Strophe (cf. Jes 1,16-17.21.26; 3,12-15; 5,7.23-24.).

(c) Zwischen individuell-personaler und (womöglich später eingefügter) imperial-außenpolitischer Perspektive schwankt das Giermotiv in dem textlich schwierigen Vers Hab 2,5-6 <sup>52</sup>. Der schlechte Textbestand in V. 5a $\alpha$  macht fraglich, auf wen die als Antwort Gottes auf die prophetische Klage gestaltete Einheit zielt. Deutlich aber ist die Bildebene, wo das scheol-gleich geöffnete Gierorgan נפש und ein Handeln im Vergleich als Todespraxis (כמות) kritisiert werden. Rekonstruktionen und Konjekturen des Subjektes bieten betrügerischen Reichtum, Räuber oder Gewalttäter (יונה) <sup>53</sup>. Die gleichfalls

<sup>49</sup> BEUKEN, *Jesaja*, 265.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. 3,12, wo die Führer den Weg des Volkes verschlingen (בלע).

<sup>51</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 141.

<sup>52</sup> L. PERLITT, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zefanja* (ATD 25.1; Göttingen 2004) 67-68; K. SEYBOLD, *Nahum, Habakuk, Zefanja* (ZBKAT 24.2; Zürich 1991) 70-72.

<sup>53</sup> LXX und V lesen als Subjekt “Wein” und bezeichnen ihn als Betrüger, 1QHab hat Reichtum und setzt verbal fort “Reichtum betrügt” den “hohen/hochmütigen” Mann. LXX übersetzt ἀνὴρ ἀλαζών, V *vir superbus*. W. RUDOLPH, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania* (KAT 13.1; Gütersloh 1975) 212 bietet: “Um so weniger wird der “Gewalttätige”, Räuber, Anmaßende sein Ziel erreichen”. Cf. GULDE, *Tod*, 131, n. 168; PERLITT, *Habakuk*, 67.

textkritisch diffizile Wendung V. 5aß (וּלֹא יִינֶה), lässt sich als “und bleibt erfolglos” bzw. “und wird nicht satt” wiedergeben<sup>54</sup>. Jede mögliche Lesart aber zeigt, was auch der nähere und weitere Kontext bestätigen: Vom Giermotiv wird die global agierende Todespraxis des Subjekts eminent moralisch kodiert; sie steht dem Verhalten des Gerechten aus 2,4 entgegen. V. 5bß hat mit dem Einsammeln der Völker einen imperialen Zug. Die Gier des o.g. Einzelnen und die babylonische Herrschaftspraxis werden in ein Vergleichsverhältnis gesetzt. Da der Gesamtvers kompositionell die Brücke zur in 2,6 eröffneten Argumentation schlägt<sup>55</sup>, verdeutlicht sich die Aussage weiter durch die dortigen ökonomischen Termini des Pfandrechts und der Kritik des Kreditwesens<sup>56</sup>. Ferner korrespondiert das Schlingen mit dem Verschlingen des Gerechten in 1,13, das in V. 14 als ausbeuterisch-naturzerstörernde Praxis konkretisiert wird<sup>57</sup>.

Seybold resümiert, man müsse für die Subjekte von 2,5 “an Aufsteiger und Höhergestellte und ihre Ansprüche denken, welche [...] als Unterdrücker, Erpresser, Betrüger, maßlose Ausbeuter u.a. gebrandmarkt werden. [...]”, was später auf die imperiale Ausdehnung der Babylonier übertragen worden sei<sup>58</sup>. Die Pointe liegt für die Endgestalt darin, dass der Singular (V. 5aα) den konkreten Raum der Sozialkritik festhält, den der redaktionelle Kontext gleichsam globalisiert<sup>59</sup>. Unrecht im sozialen Nahraum und global-imperiale Praxis werden füreinander durchsichtig.

(d) Im sozialen Nahraum ist das Motiv auch in Spr 1,12-13 verankert, wo es im Lehrgedicht 1,11-19 erscheint<sup>60</sup>. Dieses Kopfstück

<sup>54</sup> LXX bietet “vollenden”. RUDOLPH, *Micha*, 213, nennt die arabische Wurzel *njw*; Symmachus hat “erfolgreich sein”; SEYBOLD, *Habakuk*, 68 übersetzt mit Syriaca: “und wird nicht satt”.

<sup>55</sup> PERLITT, *Hababkuk*, 68. Nach SEYBOLD, *Habakuk*, 72, der Vers 2,5 öffnet die Reihe der Weherufen 2,5-2,19.

<sup>56</sup> PERLITT, *Habakuk*, 71.

<sup>57</sup> PERLITT, *Habakuk*, 68 betont, dass die Verben עָסַף und קָבַץ Erntevokabeln sind.

<sup>58</sup> SEYBOLD, *Habakuk*, 70.

<sup>59</sup> Ähnliches gilt auf der Ebene der Asaf-Psalmen bei den Subjekten des Giermotivs Ps 73,(3)9, wenn deren Bezeichnung “Prahler” in 75,5 den Fremdvölkern gilt.

<sup>60</sup> Zu Abgrenzung, Übersetzung und Gliederung A. MÜLLER, *Proverbien 1-9. Der Weisheit neue Kleider* (BZAW 291; Berlin 2000) 140-150, 145, sowie R. SCHÄFER, *Die Poesie der Weisen. Dichotomie als Grundstruktur der*

der Exposition von Sprüche 1–9 nutzt das Motiv durch die weisheitliche Höraufforderung (VV. 8-9.) für die im Buchganzen erste Beschreibung der Antitypen des Sünders (1,10-19). Im fiktiven Zitat (VV. 11-14) parallelisiert es ihre blutrünstige (V. 11) ökonomische Praxis mit der Scheol und kritisiert sie damit, wie R. Scoralick zeigt, auf subtile Weise: Steht der Bezug auf die Scheol aus der Perspektive der Sprechenden für die Unwiderstehlichkeit und Machtförmigkeit, der von ihnen gewählten und zur Nachahmung empfohlenen Lebenshaltung, so wird diese implizit als ein auch für ihre Träger selbst tödlicher Abgrund markiert: “[S]ein zu wollen, wie die Scheol bedeutet auch sich auf ein bodenloses Unterfangen einlassen, einen unstillbaren Mangel”<sup>61</sup>.

Kontextuell wird diese Praxis<sup>62</sup> als planvoll-gewaltsames Aneignen fremden Eigentums und Gewinns (הון יקר)<sup>63</sup> deutlich (VV. 13.16.19). Nach VV. 11.18 fällt das Blutvergießen im Tat-Folge-Zusammenhang auf sie zurück. Wie ihre materiellen Gewinnabsichten den immateriellen Schmuck des Weisheitsschülers (cf. VV. 9.19)<sup>64</sup>, so profiliert ihr Tod die grundlegende Lebensdienlichkeit der Weisheit<sup>65</sup>.

Generelle weisheitliche Gierkritik zeigt Spr 23,2, wo im Kontext von Tischregeln (23,1-8) drastisch, doch zunächst rein gegenständlich, vor gierigem Essen gewarnt wird. Es geht um Speise-Etikette bei Hof (V. 1). Doch konfrontiert die Bildsprache den, der “die Gier hat” mit einem Messer an der Kehle bzw. Wange. Ruft dies vordergründig dazu auf, den Appetit zu zügeln<sup>66</sup>, so wird durch das Messer-Bild sofort höchste Gefahr assoziiert. Den Konnex von

---

*Lehr- und Weisheitsgedichte in Prov 1-9* (WMANT 77; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999) 23.

<sup>61</sup> R. SCORALICK, “Hinführung zu kritischem Denken. Die erste Lehrrede im Buch der Sprichwörter (Spr 1,8-19)”, *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments, Festschrift für Erich Zenger (eds. F.-L. HOSSFELD – L. SCHWIENHORST – SCHÖNBERGER) (HBS 44, Freiburg i. Br. 2004) 548-566, 522.

<sup>62</sup> SCHÄFER, *Poesie*, 23, M. CHRISTL, *Die fremde Frau in den Proverbien* (OBO 144; Göttingen 1994) 265.

<sup>63</sup> MÜLLER, *Proverbien 1-9*, 145, betont, הון sei durchaus Ziel weisheitlichen Strebens (Spr 12,17; 24,4), kritisiert werde (Cf. Ez 22,25; Spr 28,16), der falsche Weg (1,10-13), es zu erlangen.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. SCHÄFER, *Poesie*, 30.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. SCHÄFER, *Poesie*, 30.

<sup>66</sup> O. PLÖGER, *Sprüche Salomos* (BK XVII; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 217.



Gierhaltung und Gierorgan betont lautlich das aramäische Hapax-legomenon **על** (Wange bzw. Kehle). Setzt das Messer am Gierorgan an, wird implizit eine Inversion des Giermotivs deutlich.

Sir 31,12-31 zeigt in den Anfangsversen des ersten, dem Verhalten beim Symposion gewidmeten Abschnitt (VV. 12-18[-21]), Anklänge an die Höflichkeitsregel aus Sprüche 23, doch fehlt hier die implizite Drastik die sich im die Gier begrenzenden Messer-Bild äußert. Stattdessen bemüht der Text, hier nahe am Gier-Motiv der Hebräischen Bibel das Negativbild des geöffneten Rachens. Er korreliert es mit der voreiligen Hand (VV. 14.18) und, womöglich von Spr 23,5.6 motiviert, dem Auge als Movens der Gier (V. 13), das in den bisher besprochenen Gier-Texten kaum belegt ist, hier aber explizit als böses (**κακόν** **רעה**) Schöpfungswerk Gottes bezeichnet wird<sup>67</sup>. Der Abschnitt lässt keine generelle Kritik am Reichtum und hohen Sozialstatus der Symposions-Teilnehmer erkennen<sup>68</sup>. Er bejaht den profanen Charakter dieser Feste und will zur ehrenvoll-anständigen Teilnahme anleiten, indem er die soziale Ächtung gierigen Essens in der Oberschicht thematisiert (VV. 16-17). Bemerkenswert ist aber, dass die allgemeine Anstandsregel beim Griff in die gemeinsame Essenschüssel in V. 15 durch den Rekurs auf das Nächstenliebe-Gebot (Lev 19,18)<sup>69</sup>, und die goldene Regel begründet wird, sodass auch hier Essen als "Testfall des rechten zwischenmenschlichen Verhaltens"<sup>70</sup> erscheint.

Im (erweiterten) Zahlenspruch in Spr 30,15a+15b-16 ist der Blutegel<sup>71</sup> Träger der Gierzuschreibung<sup>72</sup>. Das dem Giermotiv entstammende Nicht-Satt-Werden, das auch die Fressergottheiten in KTU 1.23,61-63 prägte, ist inhaltlich im doppelten "Gib" vorbereitet (V. 15ba); es kehrt thematisch und numerisch wieder im VV. 15-16 verklammernden zweifachen 'Nie Genug' (V. 15bβ). Strukturell tritt es

<sup>67</sup> Cf. F.V. REITERER, "Die immateriellen Ebenen der Schöpfung bei Ben Sira", in ders., *Alle Weisheit stammt vom Herrn*. Gesammelte Studien zu Ben Sira (BZAW 375; Berlin 2007) 185-227, 202-203.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. J. MARBÖCK, *Weisheit im Wandel*. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira (BZAW 272; Berlin 1999) 162, 164.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. G. SAUER, *Jesus Sirach / Ben Sira* (ATD.A 1; Göttingen 2000) 224.

<sup>70</sup> B. ZAPFF, *Jesus Sirach* (NEB; Stuttgart 2009) 199.

<sup>71</sup> Das Hapax **עילקה** bleibt strittig; cf. M. SÆBØ, *Sprüche*, 367, n. 47; HALAT, 786b.

<sup>72</sup> Womöglich war V. 15a zunächst ein eigener Zahlenspruch, der wegen der thematischen und numerischen Kohärenz VV. 15b-16 an sich zog (SÆBØ, *Sprüche*, 372-373).



mit der Scheol, der Erde, dem unfruchtbaren Mutterschoß und dem Feuer in Beziehung (cf. Jes 9,15-19). Sie gelten einander jeweils in ihrer ungebremsten und nicht satt werdenden konsumptiven Grundhaltung als vergleichbar.

Bleibt man bei der Übersetzung “Blutegel”, muss Blut das logische Objekt des “Gib her” sein. In VV. 15a+15b-16 als kompositorischer Einheit kontrastieren dann das dem Konsum per se entzogene Lebensprinzip Blut (Gen 9,4; Lev 17,11), die Scheol und der unfruchtbare Mutterschoß. Es entsteht unter der Perspektive der Gier ein Geflecht von konsumiertem Lebensprinzip (Blut vs. Egel / Mutterschoß vs. Scheol / Wasser vs. Feuer V. 16ab), Lebensende (שְׂאוֹל) und prinzipieller Lebensverhinderung (עֲצָר רָחֵם). Beides zeigt, dass es hier und dann wohl auch beim zuerst genannten Egel nicht um bloße Naturbeschreibung geht. Er steht exemplarisch für eine Haltung der Lebensfeindschaft, des Abzugs bzw. des ungehemmten Konsums von Leben. Dies bestätigt auch die Komposition, wenn sie den Spruch über die konsumptive Maßlosigkeit des Nie-Genug in eine Beschreibung mangelnder sozialer und generationeller Solidarität (VV. [10]11-17) einfügt. Im Vorvers sind die Kiefer und reißenden Zähne dieser Generation thematisiert (V. 14a), die sich daran machen, die Armen (אֲבִיּוֹנִים) in die Grube zu stoßen und die Elenden (עֲנִיִּים) zu fressen (אָכַל), ein semantisches Feld, das die Haltung des Egels fortführt. So wird er für die in V. 14 handelnden Menschen transparent. Eben diese ökonomische Perspektive legt auch das zentrale Adverb “genug” (הֵן VV. 15bβ.16bβ) nahe, das nominal gebraucht als Ziel menschlicher Blutgier im Kontext von 1,12 in der Bedeutung ökonomischer Gewinn begegnet (1,13)<sup>73</sup>. Es steht dort wie an allen weiteren Stellen der Proverbien für Besitz<sup>74</sup>. Diese Konnotation muss von daher im Konnex mit der Blutthematik von 1,12 auch hier mitgehört werden<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> Ökonomisch-materielle Größen als Objekt des Schlingens bietet auch Ijob 20,15. Dabei wird die akkumulative Praxis des Frevlers durch die Gegenbewegung des Erbrechens kontrastiert. Zu VV. 15-22, deren orale Semantik in V. 12 beginnt J. EBACH, *Hiob*. Streiten mit Gott (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995) I, 169-177, 175; H. STRAUSS, *Hiob 19,1-42,17* (BK XVI.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000) 30-32. Nach V. 19 ist der Grund die ökonomische Ausbeutung. Zu den Bezügen von 20,17 zum dtn/r Sozialgesetz cf. R. HECKL, *Hiob*. Vom Gottesfürchtigen zum Repräsentanten Israels (FAT 70; Tübingen 2010) 123-124.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. u. a. Spr 1,13; 10,15; 19,4; 22,28.

<sup>75</sup> Gegen SÆBØ, *Sprüche*, 372 und HALAT, 232; Gesenius<sup>18</sup>, 271-272.

(e) Ps 124,3 deutet das Giermotiv im lebendigen Verschlingen (בלע, חיים) durch offenen Feindesmund an. Es rahmt (cf. V. 6 לטניהם), ergänzt von weiteren Metaphern die Bedrohungserfahrung einer Wir-Gruppe. Sie drückt ihr Erleben in Bildern von Krieg (V. 2b), Raubtieren und Unterwelt (V. 3a), Feuer und Flut (VV. 3b.4-5) aus. Dies lässt auf Verfolgung, Unterdrückung und Gewalt schließen <sup>76</sup>. Die Identität der Feinde bleibt diffus. Sicher ist Jhwhs Opposition gegen sie, der die Wir-Gruppe ihr Überleben verdankt. Sollte wie Zenger andeutet <sup>77</sup>, das Motiv der schlingenden Fluten eine militärische Invasionsmetapher sein (vgl. Jes 8,7-8; 47,2; Dan 11,10.14, cf. Ex 15,14), wäre Jer 51,34.44 als Parallele relevant, da dort die Aggression Babylons bzw. die seines König ins Bild eines schlingenden (בלע) Tiermonsters gesetzt ist <sup>78</sup>.

Dieser königsideologische Konnex von Herrscher und Imperium bestätigt so die Überlegungen zur offenen Frage nach der singularischen Bezugsgröße der Gier in Hab 2,5a in seinem Kontext (cf. Abschnitt c). Auch für diese ‚außenpolitische‘ Pointe wäre angesichts der Ausbeutungslogik imperialer Invasionen die sozio-ökonomische Motivspitze sprechend. In diesem Sinne ist dann auch Klgl 2,16 zu deuten, wo im hybriden Selbstzitat des Feindes, aus einem zischen-den, mit reißenden Zähnen bestückten Mund (2,16a), die Vernichtung und die imperiale Praxis als Verschlingen erscheinen (2,16b). Dahinter aber steht in grausiger Steigerung des Verschlingens das Wissen um Jhwh als dessen eigentliches Subjekt (2,2.5.8).

(f) Auch die Feindschilderung in Ps 73,9a nutzt die in KTU 1.23, 61-62 belegte Wendung des „Aufsperren des Mundes zwischen Himmel und Erde“ um die Bedrohungsdimension zu steigern <sup>79</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> Zur Datierung cf. F.L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Psalmen 101-150* (HThKAT; Freiburg i. Br. 2005) 477.

<sup>77</sup> HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen 101-150*, 474-486, 481.

<sup>78</sup> Hos 8,7.8 nutzt das Bild für Assurs imperiale Praxis (8,10).

<sup>79</sup> Auch בלע in Ps 35,25 rahmen orale Metaphern: Sprechakt (VV. 15b.16a), Zähneknirschen (V. 16b), Mundaufsperren (V. 21a) und die Raubtiermetapher V. 17. Der Beter ist Objekt von בלע. Die Bilder von Krankheit und Gericht (VV. 11-16) sind für mehrere Konfliktlagen transparent. Deutlich charakterisiert sich das Ich (V. 10b) als bedürftig (עני ואביון) und den ‚Gewaltzeugen‘ sozial, juristisch und politisch unterlegen (Cf. SEYBOLD, *Psalmen*, 145-148; J. RO, *Die sog. Armenfrömmigkeit im nachexilischen Israel* (BZAW 322; Berlin 2002) 163-169; F.L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Die Psalmen 1-50* (NEB 29.1; Würzburg 1993) 216, 221.

Das Lexem בלע fehlt, ist aber sachlich in der über die Erde gehenden Zunge impliziert (V. 9b). Ps 73,4-12 charakterisiert die Gegner des Betenden Ichs, die V. 3 הוללים und V. 12 רשעים nennt, über ihre soziale Praxis. Leibesfülle und Schmuck legen luxuriöse Lebensführung nahe. Man kann fragen, ob dies eher fixe Zuschreibungen als reale Taten sind, doch fußen auch Stilisierungen in realem Erleben. Jedenfalls fällt auf, dass die Gegner in VV. 6-9 bekleidungsmetaphorisch und mit Metaphern der Einverleibung mit ihrem Tun identifiziert werden<sup>80</sup>: Es ist quasi ihre zweite Haut, ihnen in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen. Das orale Wortfeld beginnt, wenn man das Reden und das im Blick gleichsam internalisierte Fett (חלב V. 7a cf. Ps 63,6-7.) hinzunimmt<sup>81</sup>, schon V. 7. Es ist noch in V. 10 präsent, wo das Volk 'ihre Worte' 'wie Wasser schlürft'. VV. 8-9, dessen Bezug von Himmel, Erde, Zunge und Lippen oft im Sinne hochmütig, überhebliche Rede gedeutet wird<sup>82</sup>, fügt sich bündiger zum Kontext, wenn man mit Gulde einen Rekurs auf das Giermotiv sieht<sup>83</sup>, das fast wortgleich in KTU 1. 23, 61 für die Fressergottheiten erscheint. So wird einmal mehr deutlich: Das Motiv ist, auch wenn sich nicht belegen lässt, dass der Beter sich selbst als materiell arm sieht, sozialetisch geprägt. Der "Massenkonsum" frevlerischer Worte (V. 10) bietet dabei wieder den o.g. Dual oraler Praktiken (Schlingen und Sprechen) und rückt Ps 124, 7-10 somit in die Nähe der Belege, die den Gegnern des betenden Ichs 'Worte des Verschlingens' (Ps 52,6) zuschreiben<sup>84</sup>.

In Pss 35,25; 73,8-9, 124,7-10 aber auch in Spr 1,12-13; 30,14, besonders in der Doppelbezeichnung אביין und עני berührt die skizzierte sozialetische Spitze des Motivs die Frage nach der ökonomischen

<sup>80</sup> Cf. נאורה in V. 6a und חמט V. 6b als Halsschmuck und Kleidung. Nach HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalm 51-100*, 340, impliziert Hochmut im Psalter Rücksichtslosigkeit gegen andere (Pss 36,12; 59,13; 94,12).

<sup>81</sup> Zur Textkritik von V. 7a cf. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalm 51-100*, 333, H. IRSIGLER, *Psalm 73*. Monolog eines Weisen. Text, Programm, Struktur (ATS 20; St. Ottilien 1984) 18-20. Bei allen möglichen Lesarten ist Fett ein Symbol der Fülle bzw. des Überflusses (cf. V. 4b).

<sup>82</sup> HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen 51-100*, 341; SEYBOLD, *Psalmen I*, 283.

<sup>83</sup> GULDE, *Tod*, 142-143.

<sup>84</sup> Auch in Ps 52 ist das scharfe Reden über die Zunge (V. 4) den Worten des Schlingens (V. 6) angenähert. Wie V. 9 zeigt, handelt ein Wohlhabender, das betende Ich versteht sich als 'arm' (HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen 51-101*, 69).

mischen, sozio-politischen bzw. spirituellen Dimension der sog. Armenfrömmigkeit im AT. Sie kann hier nicht näher behandelt werden. Kaum bestreitbar aber scheint mir dies: Auch wenn religiöse Sprache generell mit Spiritualisierungen konkreter sozialer und ökonomischer Termini und Konstellationen wie Feindschaft, Ohnmacht und Armut arbeitet und ferner besonders in Gebetsformularen Typisierungen und Stilisierungen wahrscheinlich sind, die von unterschiedlichen Träger- und Rezeptionsgruppen in unterschiedlichen Konkretionsgraden geprägt und gefüllt wurden, setzen diese Transformations- und Rezeptionsprozesse erstens die Vorfindlichkeit und allgemeine Verständlichkeit der metaphorisierten Sachverhalte voraus. Damit aber halten sie zweitens auch die konkreten Dimensionen des Bildmaterials für die Rezeption vor. Angesichts der seit der späten Königszeit sozialgeschichtlich kaum bestreitbaren tiefen ökonomischen Spaltung der Gesellschaft(en) des alten Israel, behalten die Termini, unabhängig davon, ob es bei den Trägerkreisen um ökonomisch-materiell Arme oder um sozioökonomische Abgrenzungsrhetorik innerhalb der Oberschichten geht, stets auch konkrete soziopolitische Implikationen <sup>85</sup>.

(g) Abschließend sei eine weniger deutliche Beleggruppe bedacht. Sie umfasst acht Belege von בָּלַע in Num 16,30-34; 26,10-11; Dtn 11,6 und Ps 106,17, die alle mit der Konflikttradition um die sog. "Rote Korach" verbunden sind <sup>86</sup>. Subjekt der Verschlingung teils bei lebendigem Leibe (Num 16,30; 26,10-11) ist wie in Jes 9,19; 5,14 u.ö. die Erde bzw. ihr Mund, die deutlich als Tor zur Unterwelt firmiert. Verschlungen werden die Gegner Moses und Aarons <sup>87</sup>. Ihre Verschlingung, die teils mit einem Feuergericht einhergeht (Num 16,35; Ps 106,17-18) ist als Jhwhs Parteinahme für Mose und Aaron bzw. als Strafe der Gegner markiert. Gott ist als Movens im Hintergrund der schlingenden Erde erkennbar.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. zur Diskussion, Ro, *Armenfrömmigkeit*, 158, 161, 165.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. GULDE, *Tod*, 136-139 sowie R. LUX, "'Und die Erde tat ihren Mund auf ...'. Zum aktuellen Erzählinteresse Israels am Konflikt zwischen Mose und Datan und Abiram in Num 16", *Von Gott reden*. Beiträge zur Exegese und Theologie des Alten Testaments. Festschrift Siegfried Wagner (eds. D. VIEWEGER – E.-J. WASCHKE) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995) 187-216.

<sup>87</sup> Zur wechselnden Benennung der Gegner Moses in Num 16,1-35, Dtn 11,6 und Ps 106,17, cf. LUX, "Erde", 192-195.

Als Konfliktgrund nennt die breiteste Entfaltung der Tradition in Numeri 16, die hier exemplarisch behandelt sein soll, die Bestreitung der Führerschaft Moses und Aarons. Den Streit beendet eine ordalartige Kulthandlung, bei der die Opponenten, wie zuvor angekündigt, verschlungen werden. Nach den gängigen Schichtungsmodellen zählt der verschlingende Erdboden zur nichtpriesterlichen Schicht<sup>88</sup>. Ist eine ethisch-sozialkritische Pointe greifbar?

Hierauf weisen die Vorwürfe und Moses Gebet in VV. 12-15. R. Lux hat sie auf einen Konflikt der Abfassungszeit hin befragt und einem Streit um die dtr./n. Reform zugewiesen<sup>89</sup>.

Zum Vorwurf angemaßter Herrschaft (V. 13b) tritt die singuläre Nennung Ägyptens als Land, wo Milch und Honig floss (V. 13a). Mit der Erwähnung von Erbesitz an Feldern und Weinbergen (V. 14a), die ihnen vorenthalten worden seien, und der Unterstellung des Augen-Ausstechens (V. 14b), das jenseits einer Metapher der Bestechung zunächst an Verlust oder Verweigerung optisch wahrnehmbarer Güter denken lässt, deutet sich ein materieller Dissens an. Moses Gebet bestätigt die ökonomische Ebene, wenn er betont, ihnen "keinen Esel genommen" zu haben, denn Parallelen zeigen, dass die Konfiszierung von Eseln gerade gegenüber der besitzenden Oberschicht administratives Recht ist (1 Sam 8,16)<sup>90</sup>. In 1 Sam 12,3 ist sie zusammen mit einer, hier als Bestechung konnotierten, Manipulation der Augen erwähnt. Hinzu kommt schließlich, dass bei Datans und Abirams Verschlingung explizit ihr Besitz erwähnt ist (V. 33), dem fernzubleiben, das Volk zuvor gemahnt wurde (V. 26).

Auch wenn man diese Indizien nicht so klar wie Lux der Implementierung des dtr./n. Ämtergesetzes und einer spätkönigzeitlich-frühexilischen Oberschichtkritik zuordnen will, belegen sie m. E. deutlich, dass die Erzählung einen konkreten ökonomischen Konflikt hintergrund hat. Der Bezug des Füllebildes von Milch und Honig auf Ägypten und die Notiz zu Weinbergen und Äckern lassen an einst Besitzende denken, die sich jetzt benachteiligt fühlen. Darf man die Gegner-Charakterisierung aus Num 26,9 (cf. P 16,2b),

---

<sup>88</sup> Cf. H. SEEBASS, *Numeri 10,11-22,1* (BK IV.2; Neukirchen-Vlyun 2003) 178-180; LUX, "Erde", 188-189.

<sup>89</sup> LUX, "Erde", 189-191.

<sup>90</sup> Die El-Amarna-Briefe (EA 280,24-29) bieten die Wendung in der Apologie eines Königs, der um Beistand gegen Feinde bittet; Cf. B.A. LEVINE, *Numbers 1-20* (AB 4A; New York 1993) 425-427.

auch für nP heranziehen, weist sie auf Oberschichtkreise, die in Besitzstandsfragen gegen ‘Mose’ auftreten<sup>91</sup>. Mehrere Entstehungszeiten sind denkbar: Seebass denkt an die Alimentierung von Beamten mit Weinbergen und Äckern (cf. V. 14a mit 1 Sam 22,7, sowie Augenblendung in 1 Sam 11,2 und Eselspfändung in 12,3) im frühen Königtum<sup>92</sup>, Lux wegen zahlreicher dtr. Termini an Reformkonflikte der späten Königszeit<sup>93</sup>. Denkbar ist m. E. auch die perserzeitliche Krise des 5. Jhdt. In ihr kommen nach Neh 5,1-5 im Zuge von Kredit- und Steuerkonflikten Weinberge und Äcker (VV. 2-4) ‘legal’ in die Hand der Oberschicht (VV. 6-7 הוֹרִים וְסִנִּים), was Nehemia unterbinden will (VV. 10-11). Die gespaltene Oberschicht der Perserzeit wird dem (cf. VV. 13-14) kaum so einhellig zugestimmt haben wie Neh 5,12 es darstellt<sup>94</sup>. Ist Num 16\* nP als Komplementärerzählung zu Neh 5 lesbar, in der Reformverlierer der Oberschicht dem ‘mosaischen Herrscher’ Nehemia Eigennutz vorwerfen? Dass das Giermotiv in dieser Zeit zur Auseinandersetzung mit unsolidarischen Teilen der Oberschicht diente, ist jedenfalls u.a. in Jes 5,14; 9,15; Pss 52,6; 73,9; Spr 1,12-13; Ijob 20,15 deutlich.

Dies und die öfters greifbare Inversion des Motivs legen nahe, die gierige Erde, das Subjekt von בִּלַע, als der Haltung der Gerichteten korrespondierendes Gerichtsmittel zu sehen: Moses Opponenten bringt das den Tod, dessen Besitz und Qualität ihren Aufruhr motivierte (V. 14a).

#### IV. JHWH und die Gier — Die Parteilichkeit des Gottes Israels

Die biblische Wendung des mythischen Giermotivs ist prägnant und entzieht sich zugleich eindeutigen Folgerungen.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. LUX, “Erde”, 198.

<sup>92</sup> Doch sind die Verse eher nachexilisch anzusetzen; cf. W. DIETRICH, *1 Samuel 1-12* (BK VIII.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2011) 529-534.

<sup>93</sup> SEEBASS, *Numeri*, 184-185; F. CRÜSEMANN, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum*. Die antiköniglichen Texte des Alten Testaments und der Kampf um den frühen israelitischen Staat (WMANT 49; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 170-173.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. R. ALBERTZ, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (ATD.E. 8/2; Göttingen 1992) 542-549 sowie R. KESSLER, *Sozialgeschichte des alten Israel*. Eine Einführung (Wiesbaden 2006) 143-148, bes. 144.

Deutlich ist, dass das Giermotiv zwischen Ugarit und Israel in Semantik, Lexematik und thematischem Bezug konstant auf den Bereich der Lebensvoraussetzungen, -kräfte und -ressourcen, wenn man so will, auf die Ökonomie zielt. Inkonstant sind Zuschnitt und Rollenkonzepte des Giermotivs. Es verliert in der Bibel Israels die weltbildlich-systemische Grundsätzlichkeit; es gewinnt sozialetische Konkretion. Gier ist eine menschliche Praxis, sie vollzieht sich als ausbeuterisches und / oder imperiales Tun. Als solches ist sie mehr als ein moralisch-allgemeiner Negativbegriff. Sie bezeichnet das, was H.W. Wolff im Rekurs auf eine mit **אכל** gebildete Wendung aus Mi 3,2 den "Wohlstandskannibalismus" der Eliten nennt <sup>95</sup>.

Ihm tritt Israels Gott entgegen: Die Gierigen sind ebenso deutlich als seine Gegner gezeichnet wie ihre Opfer in Gerichtswort, Klage und weisheitlicher Mahnung im Fokus der Aufmerksamkeit stehen. Der Befund stellt sich im Einzelnen wie folgt dar:

Die Subjekte von **בלע** sind fast durchgängig negativ konnotiert. Sie sind Feinde der Betenden (Pss 124,3; 52,6; 55,10, Klgl 2,16), Frevler und Toren in der weisheitlichen Mahnung (Koh 10,22; Spr 1,12; 19,28; 21,20; Ijob 20,15.18), Opponenten der prophetischen Kritik (Jes 3,15; 9,15; Hab 1,13b **רשע**) bzw. die ausbeuterisch-imperialen Feinde Israels (Jer 51,34.44; Klgl 2,16; Jes 49,10 bzw. des Königs 2 Sam 17,16; 20,19).

Häufig sind die syntaktischen Objekte der Gier direkte menschliche Opfer des Schlingens (Jes 3,15; 9,15; 49,10; Hab 1,13 [**צדיק**]; Spr 1,12; Pss 35,25; 124,3; 55,10; 69,16). Hinzu tritt oft die Charakterisierung der Giersubjekte durch den raubtierhaften Mund, als noch im Sprechen entmenslichtes Gierorgan (Ps 52,6). Ist Gott syntaktisches Subjekt oder steht er sachlogisch hinter dem schlingenden Mund der Erde, so ist dies die Spitzenaussage dramatischer Klagen (Ijob 2,3; Klgl 2,2.5.8) oder eine explizite Strafe Gottes (Ex 15,12; Num 16,30-34; 26,10; Dtn 11,6).

Neben den menschlichen Opfern stehen oft im gleichen Kontext (Spr 1,13) ökonomische Begriffe wie Wohlstand, Reichtum (Spr 21,20) Besitz, Gewinn und Güter (Ijob 20,15.18 **יגא / יחיל**) als syntaktische bzw. sachliche Objekte von **בלע**. Umgekehrt sind die Opfer, explizit oder kontextuell als materiell Benachteiligte bzw. Ausgebeutete stilisiert.

<sup>95</sup> H.-W. WOLFF, *Micha*. Dodekapropheton 4 (BK XVI.4; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 70.



Eine Motiv-Inversion liegt vor, wo Gierige im Tatfolgezusammenhang oder durch Jhwhs direktes Tun Opfer der eigenen Gier werden. Dies geschieht im Valenzraum von בלע in Koh 10,22, in Spr 19,28 und vielleicht in Ps 55,10. Profaner Gebrauch deutet Ähnliches an, wenn "Verschlungenheit" als Metapher für den Alkoholrausch fungiert (Ps 107,27). Die Inversion findet ihre theologisch-metaphorische Spitze in Jes 25,7-8, wo im präzisen Rückgriff auf das Gier-Todes-Motiv aus Ugarit der Tod als der Verschlinger schlechthin nun bzw. einst selbst verschlungen wird <sup>96</sup>. Häufiger als im syntaktischen Raum von בלע aber wird sie kontextuell greifbar, wo Gott die Verschlingung der Verschlingenden bewirkt (Spr 1,12; Jes 5,14; 9, 15 [אכל]; Num 16,30-34).

Verglichen mit dem oben vorgestellten Giermotiv in Ugarit lassen sich zusammenfassend folgende biblische Transformationen benennen. Die Gier, im Baalsmythos ein Wesenszug des Todes, dessen Personifizierung sie als ontologische Größe und Naturgesetz erscheinen ließ, ist im AT theologisch geerdet, humanisiert und ethisiert. Zugleich werden die Gierigen im beibehaltenen Motivsetting latent dämonisiert. Sie sind religionsgeschichtlich betrachtet Erben des Todes; funktional erscheinen sie, den Fressergottheiten Ugarits vergleichbar, als Agenten des Todes-Gottes; eines Gottes aber den es im Denken Israels als solchen gar nicht gibt. Eine Autopoiesis der Gier gibt es im alttestamentlich biblischen Motiv-Design daher ebenso wenig.

Das AT transformiert mit der Entgöttlichung des Todes den personalen Gier-Todes-Zusammenhang mehrfach. Noch wo das Giergericht Unschuldige trifft, ist es die Folge konkret benennbarer und benannter menschlicher Individuen oder Gruppen und ihrer ökonomischen Praxis.

Der Tod der Opfer ist im Gier-Motiv des Tanach keine Folge lebensfeindlicher und doch systemnotwendiger Übermacht, mit der man sich zuletzt abzufinden hätte. Zugleich wird der Tod der Täter denkbar, der von Gott her im Tat-Folge-Zusammenhang auf sie zurückfällt. Die Gier kehrt zum Gierigen zurück; dieser reziprok-paränetische Zug, der der Entpersonalisierung des Todes entspricht,

---

<sup>96</sup> Cf. hierzu GULDE, *Tod*, 151-156 und TH. HIEKE, "‘Er verschlingt, den Tod für immer’. (Jes 25,8a). Eine unerfüllte Verheißung im Alten und Neuen Testament", *BZ* 50 (2006) 31-50.

ist im ugaritischen Gebrauch des Motivs, wo Mot nicht dauerhaft besiegt werden kann, kaum grundsätzlich ausgeprägt <sup>97</sup>.

Von hierher ist abschließend ein Vergleich der Rolle Jhwhs im Zuschnitt des Giermotivs in der Hebräischen Bibel bzw. der Götter im ugaritischen Baalsmythos reizvoll. Denn zwar hat Jhwh religionsgeschichtlich vielfach Rollen aus dem Pantheon Kanaans und den Panthea des Alten Orients integriert <sup>98</sup> und auch das Gier-Todes-Motiv zeigt solche Übernahmen; doch sind zugleich wichtige Differenzen zu benennen.

Die Gier ist im AT als menschliche Haltung doppelt tödlich. Sie tötet andere und die Gierigen. Indem sie den einen Gott Jhwh zum Gegner hat, ist sie als menschliche Haltung kritisierbar. Jhwh übernimmt als Gegner der Gier religionsgeschichtlich die Rolle Baals. Er tritt ihr entgegen, wird aber nicht ihr Opfer, sondern steht den menschlichen Opfern bei. Seine Rolle kommt — ohne, dass dies motivlich greifbar würde — strukturell der Anats nahe, wenn er den Tod derer heranzuführt, deren Gier anderen den Tod bringt.

Angesichts der parteiichen Gerechtigkeit Jhwhs aber ist es kaum zufällig, dass im Vergleich zum Rollenprofil des ugaritischen Mythos eine Position unbesetzt bleibt: Die versöhnend-unparteiische Rolle Ilus, der hinter der Lebens- und Todeskräfte harmonisierenden Schluss-Szene des Baalsmythos steht und in dessen Welt, um des Wachstums willen, der Tod regelmäßig in Kauf zu nehmen ist. Im Denken Israels ist die Gier, anders als im Baals-Mythos, weder system-notwendig oder noch gar eine göttliche Teilentität.

Wenn sich für Paulus im eschatologischen Vor- und christologischen Rückgriff auf Jes 25,8 die Auferweckung Jesu die Überwindung der Todes-Gier zugleich den Widerspruch eines Gottes, der einst ‚alles in allem‘ sein wird (1 Kor 15,26.28), gegen die „brutale und legale Gewalt menschlicher Unrechts- und Machtverhältnisse“ darstellt <sup>99</sup>, so liegt dies ganz auf der Linie der skizzierten altorientalisch-ersttestamentlichen Dynamik.

---

<sup>97</sup> Strukturell vergleichbar ist allenfalls Baals Rettung durch Anat in KTU I.6 II, 30-37.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. SMITH, *History*, passim.

<sup>99</sup> K. WENGST, *Ostern ein wirkliches Gleichnis, eine wahre Geschichte* (München 1991) 95.

So sicher Israel Jhwh auf Seiten der Opfer weiß und ihn menschlicher Gier entgegenstellt, so gewiss entmythologisiert es ihre Hypostasierung zur weltbildlich-autonomen Größe. Noch und gerade die Kritik behaftet die Gierigen bei ihrer Humanität — und bei der ihrer Opfer.

Universtitätsstr. 150  
D – 44801 Bochum

Jan-Dirk DÖHLING

#### SUMMARY

The greed motif is found in biblical and in ANE texts. The Baal Cycle characterizes Mot, the god of death and drought, as a destroyer of life. Within Ugarit's polytheistic system, Mot is nonetheless essential for agricultural growth. Mot's greed is, thus, a terrible, yet inevitable, factor. The analysis of בָּלַע (to devour, swallow) in the Hebrew Bible reveals a significant alteration. In the Old Testament, "greed" is a negative human attitude in socio-economic conflicts. In opposing greed the God of Israel addresses those who practice it and those who suffer from it as human beings.

## The Coherence of Psalms 15–24

### I. A Short *Status Quaestionis*

Over the past few years there have been a number of articles which have argued that the sequence of Psalms 15–24 is a highly structured and relatively self-contained unit. The first scholar to publish this thesis was the French structuralist, Pierre Auffret (1982) <sup>1</sup>. In addition to identifying what he considered to be semantically significant verbal and thematic symmetries between the psalms, his most significant observation was that the psalms were arranged into a concentric pattern rotating around Psalm 19 at their centre. All the other psalms in the sub-collection are arranged into a parallel pair on either side of Psalm 19, creating a chiasm with the pattern A.B.C.D. E.D'.C'.B'.A' (E = Psalm 19). The criterion for arrangement appears to be the psalm's genre <sup>2</sup>, and may be portrayed as follows:

A Ps 15 (Entrance Liturgy)  
  B Ps 16 (Song of Trust)  
    C Ps 17 (Prayer for Help)  
      D Ps 18 (Royal Psalm)  
        E Ps 19 (Creation/Torah Psalm)  
          D' Pss 20–21 (Royal Psalms)  
          C' Ps 22 (Prayer for Help)  
          B' Ps 23 (Song of Trust)  
A Ps 24 (Entrance Liturgy) <sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. AUFFRET, “Les Psaumes 15 à 24 comme ensemble structuré”, *La sagesse a bâti sa maison. Études de structures littéraires dans l’Ancien Testament et spécialement dans les psaumes* (Fribourg–Göttingen 1982).

<sup>2</sup> On the importance of genre for the editorial arrangement of the Psalter, see M. MILLARD, *Die Komposition des Psalters. Ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz* (FAT 9; Tübingen 1994).

<sup>3</sup> This pattern is provided by W. BROWN, “‘Here Comes the Sun!’ The Metaphorical Theology of Psalms 15–24”, *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (ed. E. ZENGER) (BETL 238; Leuven 2010) 259–277; here, 260.

In this pattern Psalms 20–21 have been grouped together as a single psalm, not only because they are both royal psalms but also because there is a logic to their sequence that binds them together: Psalm 20 is a prayer for the king's salvation; Psalm 21 is a thanksgiving for his salvation <sup>4</sup>.

Auffret's study provides us with a number of structural observations of varying degrees of probability but no interpretation of the function or message of the arrangement. This deficit has subsequently been addressed by the German Catholic scholars Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger. They provide us with a detailed hypothesis of the sub-collection's redactional growth and interpret the process as being primarily driven by the need to construct communal identity <sup>5</sup>. In short, they argue that an oppressed exilic and then post-exilic Israelite sub-group, namely "the poor" (*die Armen*), took a core of pre-exilic royal psalms (Psalms 18\*; 20–21\*) and both "Davidized" them, i.e. attributed them to David, and "democratized" them, i.e. transformed this royal figure into a type of the true Israelite (cf. Deut 17,14–20 and Psalm 8; compare Ps 18,21–25 with Psalms 15, 19, and 24,3–6) <sup>6</sup>. Hossfeld and Zenger argue that this group then applied this Davidic identity to themselves (David is "collectivized", as Joachim Becker puts it) <sup>7</sup>, implying that they are the ones who

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W. ZIMMERLI, "Zwillingspsalmen", *Wort, Lied, und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zu den Psalmen und Propheten* (ed. J. SCHREINER) (Würzburg 1972) 105–113. According to F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, the whole of the first book of the Psalter can be divided into four such sub-collections, each with a single psalm of praise at its centre (Psalms 8; 19; 29; 38); see their commentary *Die Psalmen I. Psalm 1–50* (NEB 29; Würzburg 1993) as well as G. BARBIERO, *Das Erste Psalmbuch als Einheit. Eine synchrone Analyse von Psalmen 1–41* (ÖBS 16; Frankfurt am Main 1999).

<sup>5</sup> F.-L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, "'Wer darf hinaufziehen zum Berg YHWH's?'. Zur Redaktionsgeschichte und Theologie der Psalmengruppe 15–24", *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel. Festschrift für Norbert Lohfink* (eds. G. BRAULIK – W. GROSS – S. MCEVENUE) (Freiburg am B. 1993) 166–182.

<sup>6</sup> "The trio Pss 18,20,21\* characterize the righteous person as the royal human who is saved by YHWH" (HOSSFELD – ZENGER, "Psalmengruppe 15–24", 176; translation mine).

<sup>7</sup> J. BECKER, "Die kollektive Deutung der Königpsalmen", *Studien zum Messiasbild im Alten Testament* (ed. U. STRUPPE) (SBA 6; Stuttgart 1989) 291–318. Hossfeld and Zenger do not go as far as Becker, who claims that the king was originally understood to be a collective entity; nor do they say that this is the only meaning of the royal language.

are the righteous servants of the Lord (the “Messianic community”; cf. Psalms 18,1; 19,13), those who will experience the salvation once granted to David, even in the face of ongoing suffering (cf. Psalms 17 and 22) <sup>8</sup>. Hossfeld and Zenger feel that this development is evidenced in the signs of a “communal consciousness” (*Gruppenbewußtsein*) that comes to expression in, e.g., Psalms 16; 18,26-32; 19; 22,4-6; 23; 24,6. Finally, they suggest, albeit only in passing, that the cosmic elements within the collection (Psalms 19; 24,1-2) function to set the faithful struggle of David and the community of the “poor” within the context of the meaning of creation itself.

Two further articles on Psalms 15–24 by the American Protestant scholars Patrick Miller (1994) and William Brown (2010) eschew diachronic reconstruction and focus entirely on the meaning that the individual psalms acquire when read synchronically as a relatively self-referential unit <sup>9</sup>. Miller’s interpretation mirrors that of Hossfeld and Zenger in that he, too, sees the idealization and democratization of David as the primary motif of the collection. Unlike Hossfeld and Zenger, he does not attribute this move to a particular Israelite group wishing to appropriate the Davidic prerogatives to itself <sup>10</sup>; rather, he claims that David is simply being held up as a role model for others to emulate. In this vein, Miller makes an important observation about the function of the more “existential” (my term) psalms which can be found between the more “theoretical” psalms (Miller’s term) that frame the collection (Psalms 15; 19; 24). In these psalms the reader is provided with a demonstration of Israel’s role-model engaged in the struggle of faith

---

<sup>8</sup> “The various experiences of salvation or the ‘salvation histories’ of both King David (Psalm 18) and the suffering individual (Psalm 22) are taken to be a paradigm for oppressed Israel [*das arme Israel*]. YHWH binds himself to the one who is oppressed [*dem Armen*] in a communion, the quality of which remains undiminished in the face of suffering and persecution and which continues after death (Psalm 16; 23)” (HOSSFELD – ZENGER, “Psalmengruppe 15–24”, 181; translation mine).

<sup>9</sup> P. MILLER, “Kingship, Torah Obedience, and Prayer: The Theology of Psalms 15-24”, *Neue Wege der Psalmenforschung*. Festschrift für Walter Beyerlin (eds. K. SEYBOLD – E. ZENGER) (Freiburg im Br. 1994) 127-142; BROWN, “Psalms 15–24”.

<sup>10</sup> It seems to me that in order to do so he would have to engage in Hossfeld and Zenger’s historical reconstruction, for the final form of the text alone does not make this clear, despite references to a community within the psalms (see my interpretation of this motif below).

(note the genre designations of confession of hope, lament, and thanksgiving). It would appear, then, that the “theory” contained in Psalms 15, 19, and 24 is put into action in Psalms 16–18 and 20–23.

Finally, William Brown applies a theory of metaphor to the collection, according to which the interaction of different images can mutually influence the way in which they are read. Brown chooses to emphasize reading from the centre outwards, with the result that the theme of (cosmic) Torah found in Psalm 19, the central psalm of the collection, is enabled to theologically appropriate and reinterpret (“complement and correct”) the other themes found in the collection (e.g. the enemies of the psalmist are transformed into sinful thoughts [cf. Ps 19,12]; the temple is replaced by the Torah as an object of desire)<sup>11</sup>. Although I take issue with this concluding thesis<sup>12</sup>, Brown makes a number of helpful exegetical observations, including one concerning the linear dimension of our collection: “As a whole, the collection began with seeking entrance to YHWH’s holy hill [Psalm 15] and concludes, climactically, with YHWH’s presence on the hill [Ps 24,7–10]”<sup>13</sup>. Although the other interpreters mentioned above have also sensed the presence of a linear dimension to the arrangement (see, for example, Miller’s theory of a “structure of prayer”) as well as the climactic nature of Psalm 24 (otherwise best described by Auffret in terms of its ability to summarize and develop the main themes of Psalm 19), no one has seen this movement in terms of a movement into Zion. It is a pity that Brown’s centrifugal reading leads him to neglect this linear dimension and even relativize the significance of the temple in relation to the law. Future interpretation must relate the themes of David and the law to this movement towards the inner-heart of the temple on Zion.

There are details of the theses presented above that I would take issue with, but I have presented their broad outlines in such a man-

---

<sup>11</sup> BROWN, “Psalms 15–24”, 169.

<sup>12</sup> I strongly disagree with Brown’s interpretation of the law in Psalm 19. He claims that it is the ultimate object of desire, yet it is the life which Torah mediates that is desired, not the Torah itself (cf. J. GOLDINGAY, *Psalms. Volume I. Psalms 1–41* [Grand Rapids, MI 2006] 293). The Torah is only a means of access to this life, a “gate” as it were. Therein lies the analogy with Psalms 15 and 24: Torah and Torah-focussed “gate liturgy” are both the means to the object of desire, that which lies *behind* the gates, the content of the temple, which — at the very least (see below) — is communion with YHWH.

<sup>13</sup> BROWN, “Psalms 15–24”, 165.



ner that I can more or less endorse what has been achieved and take this achievement as a starting point for my own refinements. Some of the points I take issue with may be briefly summarized as follows. A number of Auffret's verbal and thematic patterns are too tendentious. For example, his thesis that the theme of Ps 19,1-7 is mirrored in Psalms 20-24 whereas the legal motif of Ps 19,8-12 is found in Psalms 15-18 (creating an A.b.a'.B pattern) does not work for Psalms 18 and 23, which are in the wrong place. Auffret is forced to speak of a "tendency" only. Furthermore, his thesis that Psalms 24,1-2 / 3-6 recapitulates the themes of Psalm 19 (creation/Torah) whereas vv. 7-10 recapitulate scattered references to YHWH's intervention throughout the rest of the psalms is awkward, for his pattern mixes different "levels" of the text (prosodic units; scattered verses). Hossfeld and Zenger's interpretation is inhibited by their commitment to a particular theory of identity construction as the primary force at work in all religious movements and thus, by extension, amongst the group responsible for Psalms 15-24. This leads to a one-sided interpretation of the framing questions posed in Pss 15,1 and 24,3. Taken in their plain sense, these verses do not function to delineate an Israelite sub-group<sup>14</sup>; they function to delineate the identity of those who may enter YHWH's presence. The thrust is theocentric and not anthropocentric; the concern is with the shape of God's ways and will. Their redactional hypothesis suffers the weaknesses inherent in all analyses of this kind<sup>15</sup>. Miller's so-called "structure of prayer" is not as clean as one would wish, for its first half (Psalms 16-18) is not strictly mirrored in its parallel (Psalms 20-23). Furthermore, his emphasis on law and kingship does not pick up on the themes of creation and temple and the more eschatological perspective these themes might imply. Finally, for Miller as well as for Hossfeld and Zenger, their over-democratization of the king does not do justice to his redemptive function vis-à-vis Israel (cf. Psalms 20-21 and indeed Psalm 2, *pace* Miller). I feel that Brown exercises too much freedom in reshaping the plain sense imagery of the psalms. As I will argue below, it is unlikely that this corresponds to the approach of the editors. Furthermore, it is unjustified to ascribe so much

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. "Psalmengruppe 15-24", 168

<sup>15</sup> See M. MILLARD, "Von der Psalmenexegese zur Psalterexegese: Anmerkungen zum Neuansatz von Frank-Lothar Hossfeld und Erich Zenger", *Biblical Interpretation* 4 (1996) 311-327.

interpretive authority to the centre of a chiasm, such that all other psalms are to have their meaning changed in light of it. As I will argue below, chiasms also need to be read linearly, and Psalms 15–24 give plenty of evidence that this ought to be so.

Refinements and corrections need to be made in the following three areas:

- It is one thing to identify the presence of structural patterns; it is another to identify their function <sup>16</sup>. What kind of logic is at work in arrangements of this kind and how was the form understood to mediate the content? I will preface my exegesis with a brief summary of Emma Brunner-Traut's theory of ancient epistemology and the way this kind of "aspective" apperception relates to the literary forms of chiasm and parallelism <sup>17</sup>. This theoretical foundation will help us to ask the right kind of questions of the text and seek coherence at the right "level".
- Some of the interpreters above have hinted at an internal differentiation within the collection between an outer framework—namely Psalms 15; 19; 24 — and those psalms that intervene. I shall analyse this structure and draw out its interpretive implications.
- Most interpreters have focused primarily on the themes of king(ship) and Torah and only hinted at the significance of creation/Zion as a key to the unity of the unit. I will argue that these two interrelated concepts in fact provide us with the proper horizon for interpreting the message of the whole.

In short, my thesis will be as follows: the structure of Psalms 15–24 creates an interplay between the psalms which frame the sub-collection (Psalms 15, 19, and 24) and those that intervene. The framing psalms are more theoretical in nature and are concerned with incrementally delineating the basic shape of the divine economy of salvation, understood as God's desire to consummate creation by entering into communion with his righteous people in

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading (Bloomington, IN 1987) 119: "it is hard to separate the ideology from the art. [...] [Israel's] model of storytelling [...] adopts techniques for their functional value rather than any intrinsic worth. And among the principles that determine tactical choice, the glorification of God largely figures". See also his section "Form and Doctrine" on pp. 35-40.

<sup>17</sup> E. BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*. Am Beispiel Ägyptens (Darmstadt 1992).

Zion. The intervening psalms are more existential in nature, portraying the lived experience of the struggle of faith. The subject of the struggle of faith is the partner with whom God wishes to enter communion: the king, David, and his people. The function of the framing psalms is to contextualize this struggle by setting it within its ultimate theological context.

## II. Aspect and Paratactic Presentation in the Bible

What was the function of chiasmic presentations of religious material in ancient Israel? One of the problems modern readers have when confronted with paratactically organized texts is the apparent lack of logical coherence. According to Brunner-Traut, this is because we have been trained to perceive our world in terms of perspective. Reality is understood to be an organically interconnected structure whereby each element has its unique place within the whole. Phenomena are then viewed from a particular standpoint located outside the object under observation. The viewer's subjective standpoint influences the way the particular phenomena are perceived; if our standpoint changes, so too does our apprehension of the relationship of the parts.

The ancient world was no less convinced of the unity of reality, yet it did not attempt to grasp this reality from a single, overarching and unifying standpoint. The ancients tended to view a single phenomenon from multiple perspectives at the same time in a manner that Brunner-Traut has labelled aspective. Herbert Klement, who has sought to apply this concept to the interpretation of the Books of Samuel, summarizes her view in relation to the Bible as follows: the biblical writers were interested in a gradual comprehension, a succession of perceptions in contrast to an overall view. Aspectival perception brings the manifestations into a bilateral relationship. By this an overview is given of a subject in which its individual parts are grasped and combined into a cumulative structure of these same individual parts <sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> H. KLEMENT, *II Samuel 21-24. Context, Structure and Meaning in the Samuel Collection* (EUSS 23/EHR 23; Frankfurt am Main 2000) 89-90.

Although Brunner-Traut is primarily concerned with Egypt, she does mention the juxtaposition of the two creation narratives in Genesis 1 and 2 as an example of aspectival perception.<sup>19</sup> On her reading, the function of this juxtaposition would be to illuminate a single subject matter—in this case creation—by allowing the interplay of various images to make it more “tangible and multidimensional” (“*faßbarer und runder*”)<sup>20</sup>.

All statements in parallel (*nebeneinander*) produce a unity (*ein Einziges*). They are bound by their knowledge of their common subject matter (*das Wissen von dem gemeinsamen Einen*), yet they cannot be unified by being correlated according to the rules that apply to a detached observer, one situated within a *camera obscura*<sup>21</sup>.

Interestingly, Brunner-Traut believes that the same principle of aspective perception is at work in the poetic device of *parallelismus membrorum*, whereby a series of individual statements are brought into juxtaposition in order to illuminate a single thought<sup>22</sup>. This is corroborated by Adele Berlin’s metaphor of “binocular vision” to describe the semantic function of poetic parallelism. As she puts it, “Like human vision (parallelism) superimposes two slightly different views of the same object and from their convergence produces a sense of depth”<sup>23</sup>. If we take into account the recent work by, e.g., Jan Peter Fokkelman and Beat Weber, who argue that semantic parallelism can be found at all levels of the prosodic hierarchy (verses, strophes, stanzas, sections)<sup>24</sup>, as well as Matthias Millard’s argument that in the final form of the Psalter entire psalms have been juxtaposed according

---

<sup>19</sup> BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*, 124: “The two Genesis reports are only offensive to those who seek a single *point de vue*” (translation mine).

<sup>20</sup> BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*, 124: “*Viele Bilder umkreisen das Numen, so daß es faßbarer und runder werde*”.

<sup>21</sup> BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*, 124 (translation mine). Klement notes that such “an aspectival view can show greater congruity with actuality, because in this way objects and people are depicted in a way which is more in accordance with their being than would be possible with a mere spatial portrayal of their visible surface” (KLEMENT, *II Samuel*, 91).

<sup>22</sup> BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*, 153.

<sup>23</sup> A. BERLIN, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, IN 1985).

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible*. At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis. Vol. 3 (SSN 43; Assen 2003); B. WEBER, *Werkbuch Psalmen I*. Die Psalmen 1–72 (Stuttgart 2001) 99.

to the principles of *parallelismus membrorum* <sup>25</sup>, we can see that a proper understanding of the semantics of juxtaposition (or parataxis) holds great potential for helping us grasp the unity of the Psalter.

One final observation needs to be made about a particular characteristic of biblical parallelism before I summarize the implications this theory should have for our exegesis of Psalms 15–24. Brunner-Traut defines the decisive characteristics of these poetic “thought couplets” as “repetition, variation, intensification [*Steigerung*] and contrast” <sup>26</sup>. Robert Alter has analysed the semantics of biblical parallelism and concludes that there is a typical pattern that arises when one reads a text linearly from colon A to colon B (and by extension, although Alter does not countenance this possibility, from stanza or psalm A to stanza or psalm B). This movement consists in a “heightening or intensification ... of focusing, specification, concretization, even what could be called dramatization” <sup>27</sup>. Alter characterizes this “structure of intensification” as “incipiently narrative” <sup>28</sup>, for it creates a sense of movement towards a goal. He summarizes this theory in relation to verse-level parallelism within a psalm as follows:

If [...] one recognizes that the semantic orientation of the system of apparent repetitions [...] is toward a focusing, a heightening, a concretization, a development of meaning, it is possible to see that the movement generated between versets (i.e. cola) is then carried on from line to line into the structure of the poem <sup>29</sup>.

What are the implications of this approach for our interpretation of Psalms 15–24?

- First of all, we should seek its unity at the level of what the editors considered to be the common referent of the individual psalms, a referent which they sought to elucidate by means of their chiasmic juxtaposition. In other words, how does the juxtaposition of the various messages and images function to illuminate a single subject matter within its various dimensions? As stated above, I take this subject matter to be the struggle of faith within the context of the divine economy.

---

<sup>25</sup> MILLARD, *Komposition*. We have already seen this principle above in relation to Psalms 20–21.

<sup>26</sup> BRUNNER-TRAUT, *Frühformen des Erkennens*, 153.

<sup>27</sup> ALTER, *Poetry*, 19.

<sup>28</sup> ALTER, *Poetry*, 28.

<sup>29</sup> ALTER, *Poetry*, 28.

- Second, in light of the “structure of intensification”, we should look for a linear as well as a concentric reading of chiasm<sup>30</sup>. In particular, we need to be aware of the presence of an implicit “narrative element” as the reality within which the diverse psalms of our collection cohere. Again, this accords with my theory that the one content of the collection is the struggle of faith within the divine economy, for this economy has a broadly narrative structure.

Having now established a theoretical framework, we turn to the sub-collection of Psalms 15–24. I will first read each psalm in terms of its development by its parallel (§III), demonstrating the presence of a “structure of intensification”. The second half of the chiasm does not just repeat the first half, it also develops it by broadening and refining its theological horizon as well as intensifying its imagery (with the special exception of Psalms 18 // 20–21; see below). I will then show how the framing psalms (15; 19; 24) stand apart from the rest and function — in an incremental manner — to clarify the ultimate context for interpreting the whole (§IV).

### III. *Parallelismus Psalmorum*

The inter-psalmic pattern of intensification occurs in two ways: 1) the content of the first psalm is consistently intensified and set within a more developed theological horizon; 2) as a part of this pattern, the speaking subject of the A-psalm is consistently related to the larger community in the B-psalm as an exemplar or type of it. A brief word should be said here about the identity of this subject before we proceed with our analysis. In the superscriptions he is explicitly identified as “David”. Although the historical superscriptions (e.g. in Pss 3,1 and 18,1) as well as the concluding colon in Ps 72,20 indicate that the historical figure was indicated, there are other indications that he was also interpreted in eschatological categories (e.g. Ps 18, 44–46 and the

---

<sup>30</sup> Millard makes this point in relation to Psalms 15–24 without going on to interpret the collection: “The message (*Pointe*) of every chiasm does not consist in the mere repetition of particular words or motifs in reverse order. It consists in the small variations [...] . Every chiasm is thus also part of a linear structure. The message only becomes evident when the reader bears the first half of the chiasm in mind when reading the second half” (MILLARD, “Mitte des Psalters”, 258–259; translation mine).

position of Psalm 2 at the head of the Psalter [cf. Jer 23,5; Ezek 34,23]), perhaps as a type of the coming messiah. It would be overhasty to set the categories of “historical” and “eschatology” in contrast to each other, as if they were mutually exclusive (note the presence of history and eschatology in Psalm 18). Given the complexity of the issue, however, and the need for further research on the subject, I shall simply refer to the speaking subject as “David” or the “king” and leave open the question of a “messianic” referent<sup>31</sup>.

The pattern of theological specification is most clear in the framing psalms, Psalms 15 and 24. Psalm 15 is concerned with the question of who may access the reality within the sanctuary of the Lord (v. 1). The bulk of the psalm is “Torah” (vv. 2-5b), leading some of the interpreters discussed above (Miller; Brown) to identify the law as being the primary concern of our collection. Yet it is important to realize that in Psalm 15 the revelation of God’s will is placed within a particular framework. Psalm 15 is not just a “Torah psalm”; it is a “Torah entrance psalm”. In other words, the law is subordinated to one of Israel’s key institutions: the sacred sanctuary in Zion. In this context, “Torah” functions as a means of access to this special place, understood to be the locus of the blessing that obedience may bring. The law is a means to which the reality in the temple is its end. It is this reality that is the desired destination of the psalmist, the place where he can enjoy the “stability” he yearns for (v. 5; cf. Ps 24,1-2)<sup>32</sup>. Whether one believes that Psalm 15 is a fragment of ritual practice (an “entrance liturgy”) or whether it is only an echo of such a practice<sup>33</sup>, we

---

<sup>31</sup> For a detailed attempt at a diachronic reconstruction of this concept in the Psalter, see M. KLEER, *Der liebliche Sänger der Psalmen Israels. Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen* (BBB 108; Bodenheim 1998). For a more synchronic reading that emphasises David’s messianic identity, see E. ZENGER, “Das Buch der Psalmen”, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. C. FREVEL) (Stuttgart 2012) 428-463, especially 437-438.

<sup>32</sup> At the outset, then, my interpretation differs strongly from that of Brown (see §1), who starts from Psalm 19 and “corrects” the temple imagery in Psalms 15 and 24 by replacing it with that of the law. Yet I also disagree with his interpretation that in Psalm 19 the law is the ultimate object of desire. In Psalm 19 the object of desire is not the law but that to which the law gives us access. The law is a means to an end, and that end is life—just like the life that is present within the temple. In this sense, the function of the law in Psalm 19 is analogous to that of Psalms 15 and 24.

<sup>33</sup> It has become commonplace in more recent exegesis to argue that Psalm 15 only echoes a temple liturgy and that in its present form it is influenced



see here *in nuce* an instantiation of a broader biblical pattern whereby the temple — whether historical, eschatological, metaphorical, or all three — is the place of fulfilment and life. When read on its own, Psalm 15 speaks only of the needs of an individual in relation to this spatially bounded quality of existence. It is likely, however, that a post-exilic editor may have seen that more is involved in entering such a space. It is the function of Psalm 24 to explicate this broader theological context <sup>34</sup>.

Psalm 24 contains the structure of Psalm 15 in miniature (question: v. 3; answer: v. 4; promise: v. 5), and yet it embeds its concerns between a confession of YHWH's ownership of the world (vv. 1-2) and a dramatic portrayal of this owner about to enter, in the capacity of a warrior, the same place to which the individual of Psalms 15 and 24,3 desired access, namely the temple on Zion (vv. 7-10). Although interpreters have often struggled to identify the coherence of Psalm 24, its movement from creation to law to YHWH's entry into the temple appears to instantiate in more detail a typical biblical pattern whereby the Lord creates the world (vv. 1-2) and then consummates it by entering it in order to dwell with his people (vv. 7-10), yet only after he has first revealed how they may dwell with him (vv. 3-6). An example of this pattern is the P document, which portrays the establishment of the Sabbath and the tabernacle as the climax of creation (Exod 31,16-17), such that God's dwelling with his people is understood to be the meaning of creation. In the prophets, especially Isaiah, Zion/Jerusalem is the destination of the returning exiles who have been purified by the judgment of exile, a narrative pattern that sits well with Psalm 24's juxtaposition of Jacob's entry into Zion (vv. 3-6) and YHWH's (vv. 7-10) (whereby it is interesting to note that vv. 7-10 do not explicitly indicate who YHWH has fought against: the enemies of righteous Israel to redeem

---

by other concerns. Cf. the Psalms commentaries by P. Craigie; E. Gerstenberger; F.-L. Hossfeld – E. Zenger; J. Goldingay; R. CLEMENTS, "Worship and Ethics: A Re-Examination of Psalm 15", *Worship and the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of John T. Willis* (eds. M. GRAHAM – R. MARRS – S. MCKENZIE) (Sheffield 1999) 78-94. Given that none of these interpreters relates Psalm 15 to Psalm 24 in the way that I do, they do not pick up the narrative element as I do.

<sup>34</sup> For a detailed analysis of the coherence of Psalm 24 which argues that it contains a narrative pattern similar to the one I am arguing for in this sub-collection as a whole, see my forthcoming article "The Coherence of Psalm 24" *JSOT* (date of publication as yet undetermined).

it or Israel itself to make it righteous)<sup>35</sup>. The presence of an “eschatological” narrative portraying the consummation of creation in Psalm 24 is also supported by its poetic representation of space: funnel-like, in progressing stages of growing particularity, we move from the world (vv. 1-2) to the foot of a mountain (the question is who may ascend; v. 3) and then to the top of the mountain, directly in front of the gates of the sanctuary<sup>36</sup>. Finally, if it is the case that the joint entry into the temple in vv. 3-6 and 7-10 functions to consummate the protological/eschatological reality in vv. 1-2, it is interesting to note the thematic connection between vv. 1-2 and the conclusion of Ps 15,5c: “Whoever does these things will never ‘totter’”. The fruit of entering the temple in Psalm 15 and the protological quality of creation as “stable” in Psalm 24 (note the pillars in the raging seas) are the same (cf. Pss 93,1; 96,10). Kraus’ commentary on Ps 15,5c makes a connection along these lines on cultic grounds: “The one [...] who enters the sanctuary is stepping on ground which the great cosmic catastrophes cannot touch. [...] This event of having a part in Yahweh the ‘eternal rock’ is understood to be something continuous, something that influences and determines the life of human beings, Ps. 112,6\*. The מְלֹאָה in v. 5\* is to be understood in this sense (cf. also Ps. 16,8\*)”<sup>37</sup>. We thus see that in Psalm 24, Psalm 15’s question of who may access the reality on the other side of the gates (cf. Ps 24,3) is now explicitly calibrated to cosmological and possibly eschatological concerns<sup>38</sup>. The effect is to contextualize Psalm 15’s question and answer by placing them within (what the editor considered to be) their ultimate theological context<sup>39</sup>. In short,

<sup>35</sup> On the function of creation within eschatology, see H.-J. KRAUS, “Schöpfung und Weltvollendung”, *EvT* 24 (1964) 462-485.

<sup>36</sup> This is picked up to a degree by D. HIRSCH – N. ASHKENAZY, “Translatable Structure, Untranslatable Poem: Psalm 24”, *Modern Language Studies* 12 (1982) 21-34.

<sup>37</sup> H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalms 1-59* (CCS; Minneapolis, MN 1993) 231.

<sup>38</sup> The Targum paraphrases v. 9 as follows: “Lift up your heads, O gates of the garden of Eden [...] that the glorious king might enter” (translated by D. STEC, *The Targum of Psalms*. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes [London 2004] 62; italics original, indicating additions to the MT).

<sup>39</sup> Kraus notes that “Zion in the OT has the character of an ultimate reality (Isa. 2:1ff.) that far transcends all earthly living conditions” (KRAUS, *Psalms*, 231). In that case, we might expect developments along these lines where Zion is the primary theme.

righteousness is not just the means by which an individual gains access to divine blessing; its realization is also an essential element within God's economy of salvation for the cosmos and Israel.

This movement between Psalms 15 and 24 accords with Brunner-Traut's theory of aspect mentioned above. We have a progressive, stepwise elucidation of a single subject matter, namely the economy of salvation (for Psalm 15 is also about salvation, albeit in a more limited horizon), composed of "self-contained" blocks of material set in juxtaposition to each other<sup>40</sup>. Furthermore, in line with Alter's thesis, the contextualization which Psalm 15 receives at the hands of Psalm 24 is of a narrative quality: the entrance of the righteous individual into the place of life is part of a divine entrance into the same place, understood as the moment whereby creation (vv. 1-2) is consummated. I will pick up this narrative theme again in §IV below when discussing these psalms in relation to Psalm 19. For now we should note one other pattern of theological development that applies to our remaining psalms: the "typologizing" of David.

The "who" of Psalm 15 was an individual (note the singular participle in v. 5), perhaps the Davidic "author" (cf. Miller, Hossfeld – Zenger). Psalm 24 opens with a similar focus on the individual (note the verbs), but concludes climactically by applying this identification to a group: "Such is the generation of those who have recourse to him, of those who seek the face of the God of Jacob [LXX]/who seek your face: Jacob [MT]"<sup>41</sup>. God's answer to the Davidic king as an

---

<sup>40</sup> In order to fully appreciate the editor's message, it would be helpful to further pursue the kinds of diachronic analysis provided by Matthias Millard and Hossfeld – Zenger. To what degree were the parts of the psalms composed for their current context (cf. Hossfeld – Zenger's redactional approach) or simply imported as whole cloth from elsewhere (cf. Millard's "generic-compositional" theory). I tend to find that my interpretation strengthens Millard's theories of composition, while it also strengthens Hossfeld and Zenger's tendency to read the Psalter eschatologically.

<sup>41</sup> The MT reading appears to be stronger, despite its unusual syntax. See N. TROMP, "Jacob in Psalm 24: Apposition, Aphaeresis or Apostrophe?", *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. Festschrift J.P.M. Van der Ploeg* (eds. W C. DELSMAN – J. PETERS – J. NELIS) (Kevelaer 1982) 271-282. I do not follow Tromp or Hossfeld – Zenger, however, in reading it as a reference to the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to (Jacob in) Zion. Instead, I read it as a chiasm, whereby "Jacob" stands in parallel to "this is"—cf. J. GOLDINGAY, *Psalms: 1*; P. BOTHA, "Answers Disguised as Questions: Rhetoric and Reasoning in Psalm 24", *Old Testament Essays* 22 (2009) 535-553.

individual in Psalm 15 is now true for all of Israel. When read “in parallelism”, we see that the Davidic figure becomes a typical example of Israel’s proper identity.

This pattern of theological contextualization with the correlation of an individual to the community is repeated throughout the rest of the psalms, with an interesting development in the relation of Psalms 18/20–21.

Thus, Psalms 16 and 23 both belong to the genre “songs of confidence”. The common theme is an affirmation of the joyfulness of life in the presence of the Lord (cf. 16,11; 23,6; as desired in Ps 15,1 and promised to the obedient in Ps 15,5, and as brought to the threshold of consummation in 24,7–10) as well as trust in this reality in the face of forces that mitigate against it. Alter’s principle of “intensification” can already be seen in the extent of metaphorical imagery used to describe the king’s relationship to his God: Psalm 23 is full of it whereas in Psalm 16 it is limited to a single strophe (vv. 5–6)<sup>42</sup>. More significant, however, is the difference in the content of the imagery, one which reflects a difference identified above between Psalms 15 and 24. Psalm 16, like its antecedent Psalm 15, is static in that the symbolism used to describe David’s relationship to God is one of “dwelling” (cf. Ps 15,1) in his presence, indeed within God himself<sup>43</sup>. The language of “chosen portion”, “inheritance”, “lines” and “lot” evokes the distribution of the land to the tribes (cf. Josh 13,23; 14,4; 15,3; 17,5; Numbers 18–21; Deut 4,21), whereas here it is God himself who is the space within which the psalmist lives in “‘mystic’ union”<sup>44</sup>. Psalm 23, however, introduces the element of journey to the place of presence — now deferred to a moment of arrival in the future after a period of tribulation<sup>45</sup>. In other words, a

---

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Gunkel’s comments on Psalm 23: “In general Hebrew poetry tends to make use of images that are briefly alluded to and rashly jotted down; such a careful execution as this is one of the exceptions” (H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* [Göttingen 1986], 98; translation mine).

<sup>43</sup> ZENGER speaks of an experience of “YHWH as living space (*Lebensraum*)” (HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen: 1*, 108; translation mine).

<sup>44</sup> KRAUS, *Psalms: 1*, 238.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. ZENGER, in HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen: 1*, 152: “As a whole, the psalm consists of a progressive movement that comes to a standstill at the end. The psalm begins with the image of being on the move, alludes to the dangers on the way, pushes forward to an arrival in a protective house and concludes with an emphasis on continual residence within this house” (translation mine).

distinction is introduced between the proleptic experience of God's presence in the "valley of the shadow of death" (v. 4; cf. Jer 2,6) and the abundance of the "house of the LORD"<sup>46</sup>, the destination of the king's difficult journey, which is located beyond the "wilderness". This dynamic sense of movement links up with the movement I have just described for Psalm 24 as a whole and which is encapsulated in the different way in which it poses the question in v. 3: not Psalm 15's "who may dwell with the LORD" but "who may *ascend* to the LORD". There is a mountain to be climbed, a journey to be undertaken. The experience of God in Psalm 16 is thus theologically clarified by Psalm 23. Although Psalm 16 was also composed in a context of suffering (cf. v. 1), Psalm 23 highlights that the blessed reality tasted in Psalm 16 is only fully realized at the end of a laborious journey of suffering, in which God travels with his king to the place of consummation, the temple in Zion. In Psalm 24, we see this couple on the verge of arrival.

Psalm 23 does more than embed Psalm 16 within a broader theological narrative, it also serves to turn David into a type of the true Israelite. This is because, as a number of interpreters have noted, the experience sketched in Psalm 23 is a recapitulation for an individual of the experience of Israel as a whole<sup>47</sup>. The imagery of provision and guidance through the wilderness by a shepherd king who brings his flock to the temple, the place of his special presence, is an echo of the themes of the Exodus from Egypt and of the New Exodus from Babylon (cf. Pss 77,21; 78,52-53; Isa 40,11; Ezekiel 34; Deut 2,7; Neh 9,21), now individualized within the flesh of the king<sup>48</sup>. Psalm

---

<sup>46</sup> Other translation possibilities for the difficult Hebrew phrase צֶלְמֻת are "very deep shade" or "total darkness". Cf. P. CRAIGIE, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Nashville, TN 1985) 207.

<sup>47</sup> D. FREEDMAN, "The Twenty-Third Psalm", *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy* (Winona Lake, IN 1980) 275-302; M. BARRÉ – J. KSELMAN, "New Exodus, Covenant, and Restoration in Psalm 23", *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*. Festschrift for D.N. Freedman (ed. C.L. MEYERS) (Winona Lake, IN 1983) 97-127; HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen: 1*, 152-154.

<sup>48</sup> FREEDMAN, "Psalm 23", 276: the experience of the Exodus is both personalized and universalized. The connection with the Exodus had long been picked up by the Targum: "1. A psalm of David. *It is the LORD who fed his people in the desert; they lacked nothing.* 2. *In a place of thirst, he makes me rest ...* 3. *He restores my soul with manna; ...* 4. *Even when I go into exile in the valley of the shadow of death ...* 5. *You spread a table before me, manna*

23 thereby provides Israel with a glimpse into David's "inner life" as he treads the same stony path that they as a nation must follow.

Again, Psalm 22 sets Psalm 17 within a broader theological horizon, intensifying its imagery and turning the fate of its speaking subject into a type of those who seek the Lord (cf. Ps 22,27 with Ps 24,6). Psalm 22's more comprehensive scope is first indicated by its use of diverse genres. Whereas Psalm 17 appears to be a fairly typical complaint consisting of invocation, protestation of innocence, petition, complaint, and imprecation<sup>49</sup>, Psalm 22 is a "mixed construction of heterogeneous genre elements (complaint, petition, praise, thanks, hymnic intentions to praise with predictions of the future)"<sup>50</sup>. In addition to this, Psalm 22's representation of the polarities of suffering and joy are far more extreme than in Psalm 17<sup>51</sup>. In its talk of utter abandonment by God (v. 2) in which the petitioner is dehumanized (v. 7) Psalm 22 starts "lower", and yet it ends far "higher", for by the end of the psalm we reach an eschatological hymn of praise extending spatially to the ends of the earth (v. 28) and temporally to include future generations (v. 32), indeed even those who have died (v. 30)<sup>52</sup>. Whereas Psalm 17, like Psalm 16, concludes with an affirmation of the blessedness of abiding in the presence of YHWH (v. 11), in Psalm 22, as in Psalm 24, the reach of the kingdom of God (v. 29; cf. 24,7.9) is cosmic in scope (cf. 24,1-2).

Finally, it is important to note that the axis upon which the shift from complaint to universal praise moves is the personal experience of David himself. As Goldingay puts it, "v. 24 makes clear that the promise (v. 22) and the summons (v. 23) do actually relate to the particularity of what YHWH has done for this suppliant"<sup>53</sup>. The king's suffering and redemption are grounds for the "true Israel"

---

*is raised up in front of my oppressors; you make my body fat with stout birds, and the head of my priests with the oil of anointing"* (STEC, *Targum*, 61).

<sup>49</sup> E. GERSTENBERGER, *Psalms, Part 1*. With an Introduction to Cultic Poetry (FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, MI 1988) 108.

<sup>50</sup> HOSSFELD, in HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen:1*, 144.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. KRAUS, *Psalms:1*, 300: "Psalm 22 traverses unimaginable dimensions. From the depths of abandonment by God, the song of the rescued person rises to a worldwide hymn that draws also the dead into a great homage of Yahweh".

<sup>52</sup> Goldingay thus calls this act of praise "particularly remarkable and extensive" (GOLDINGAY, *Psalms:1*, 323).

<sup>53</sup> GOLDINGAY, *Psalms:1*, 336.



to have hope (vv. 24–25) <sup>54</sup>. Once again, David has become a type of the true Israel: suffering yet certain of ultimate vindication. We may also note that whereas it was the temple as the locus of God's fullest presence that connected Psalm 23 with Psalm 24, in Psalm 22 it is the royal imagery of the kingdom of God. The conclusion of Psalm 22 provides a picture, as it were, of what awaits the suffering king/community once they have ascended to Zion from the Valley of the Shadow Death.

We now come to the final pairing in this sub-collection, the royal Psalms 18 and 20–21, with their common focus on the salvation of the king from his enemies. With this juxtaposition, the pattern of “intensification” I have identified so far appears to be reversed. In this case, it is Psalm 18, the first psalm of the pair, that has the explicit eschatological horizon at its conclusion with its language of the universal dominion of the king (vv. 44–46; Psalms 20 and 21 both simply end with a cry for help). God will remain faithful to the Davidic lineage and submit all nations to him. Its imagery is also more vivid, with its extended description of the divine theophany that takes up its opening stanza (vv. 8–16; the descriptions in 20,7b.9 and 21,10 are far tamer by comparison). There is one key difference, however, that leads me to conclude that Psalms 20–21, despite their lack of obvious eschatology and poetic vibrancy, function to clarify Psalm 18 by contextualizing it theologically within the divine economy (and the reversal of the pattern may intend to highlight this). This is found in the fact that the speaking subjects of these psalms are Israel, the people of the king, and not the king himself. In other words, these psalms are being articulated by those whose identity in Psalms 22–24 are correlated with that of the king. The correlation can also be found in Psalms 20–21. Just as David trusts in the Lord (21,8), so too do his people (20,7); just as David is saved as a result of this faith (20,7; 21,2–7), so too are his people (20,8). In both cases, whether for Israel or for David, it is the Lord who is the ultimate agent of salvation. The theological contribution of Psalms 20–21 to this act of correlating is that here they portray the king as the particular vehicle by means of which Israel is

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. HOSSFELD, in HOSSFELD–ZINGER, *Psalmen:1*, 145: “The deliverance of the individual with its collective significance should be a signal to the nations and the generations within the flow of time to abide by the kingdom of YHWH” (translation mine).



saved. Israel longs for the salvation of the king in these psalms, for in it they find their own. As such, Psalms 20–21 clarify Psalm 18 theologically by establishing the nature of the king's role within the divine economy. His obedience, suffering and salvation are for the sake of another, his people, who are to imitate him in every respect.

At this juncture it is worth noting that this way of construing the theological development of Psalms 15–18 by Psalms 20–24 mirrors the move from Psalm 1 to Psalm 2 at the opening the Psalter. These two psalms are also concerned with true means to life or “happiness” (cf. Psalms 15; 19; 24). In Psalm 1, the individual who is happy is the one who lives in obedience to God's revealed will, avoiding the infectious company of the wicked. In Psalm 2, the people who are happy are those who seek refuge in the Davidic king, their saviour in Zion, rejecting the insubordination of the rebellious nations. We thus have a twofold portrayal of the way to life in its fullness: obedience to God's revealed will and subjection to the rule of God's earthly king. In this, the king relates to his people both as their role model and their redeemer<sup>55</sup>.

#### IV. Outer Frame

Having started at the corners of our collection and moved inwards, we come to the centrepiece of the ensemble, Psalm 19, a psalm that meditates upon the significance of Torah within the horizon of creation and calls upon YHWH to help David to follow this law. Although the psalm lacks a parallel pair, it appears to be intimately connected with Psalms 15 and 24, the two psalms which frame our collection. For a start, we may notice the common air of reflectiveness that distinguishes these psalms from Psalms 16–23 (Gerstenberger has described Psalm 19 as “very objective, distant, and meditative”; note Miller's analysis of the sub-collection above)<sup>56</sup>. More significant are the themes that unite these psalms and the pattern of their arrange-

---

<sup>55</sup> I thus disagree with interpretations such as the one by Patrick Miller which effectively subordinate Psalm 2 to Psalm 1 by understanding the juxtaposition to consist solely in the democratization of the king; cf. P. MILLER, “The Beginning of the Psalter”, *Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. McCann) (JSOTSS 159; Sheffield 1993), 83–92.

<sup>56</sup> GERSTENBERGER, *Psalms: I*, 101.

ment. Concerning the former, Psalm 19 shares with Psalm 15 and Ps 24,3-6 an interest in Torah as a means to “access” life, albeit without reference to the temple as the place where this life is available in particular density (vv. 8-11) <sup>57</sup>. It also shares with Ps 24,1-2 an interest in creation as the ultimate horizon for the meaning of the content of the rest of the psalm (vv. 1-7) <sup>58</sup>. As Hossfeld summarizes it, vv. 2-11 portray the interplay “of creation and the revelation of the will of YHWH. The order undergirding the flow of time that has manifested itself ever since the beginning of creation in the continual orbits of the heavenly bodies (the sun) finds its continuation in the life-giving Torah” <sup>59</sup>. According to Psalm 19, obedience to God’s will not only gives one access to God’s presence, but it also aligns one — in some as yet undefined way (cf. Psalm 24) — with the very structure of the cosmos.

The special structural relationship between these three psalms becomes most evident when we notice the particular pattern by which the themes are arranged: the two major stanzas of Psalm 19 are concerned with creation (vv. 1-7) and Torah respectively (vv. 8-15). Psalm 15 as a whole is only concerned with one of these themes, Torah, whereas Psalm 24 is concerned with both of them (vv. 1-2; 3-6) plus the significant addition of a new element: the arrival of YHWH in his temple (vv. 7-10). The thematic pattern that is created when we read these psalms linearly is thus B./A.B’./A’.B’.C (each element coinciding with a discrete prosodic unit, whether strophe[s] or stanza) <sup>60</sup>:

---

<sup>57</sup> Given that it is the reality behind the gates of the temple that matters and not the external frame of the temple itself, I take the parallelism between Torah → temple on the one hand and Torah → life on the other to be theologically synonymous.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. WEBER, *Psalmen*, 130: “The opening verses 1-2 create (literally!) the ‘foundation’ of the following anthropological-ethical and theological statements and at the same time prepare the reader for them” (translation my own). Within the context of the collection as a whole, Hossfeld and Zenger claim that YHWH’s defence of righteousness is the “‘meaning,’ not only of his history with David as the king of Israel but also as the ‘meaning’ of creation itself (Ps 24,1-2)” (translation mine). See also E. OTTO, “Kultus und Ethos in Jerusalemer Theologie: Ein Beitrag zur Begründung der Ethik im Alten Testament”, *ZAW* 98 (1986) 161-179.

<sup>59</sup> HOSSFELD, in HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen: I*, 134.

<sup>60</sup> Auffret is the only commentator to have come close to this observation (AUFFRET, “Psaumes 15 à 24”, 437). He sees the parallel between Psalms 24 and 19 in terms of creation and Torah, but sees vv. 7-10 as paralleled with the second “pane” (*volet*) of the subcollection, which apparently has a greater

Psalm 15 (entrance Torah) → Psalm 19 (creation/Torah) → Psalm 24 (creation/entrance Torah/arrival).

If the function of creation is to set the horizon for the meaning of Torah and if the function of the arrival scene in Ps 24,7-10 is to mark the consummation of creation, then what we have in this arrangement is a step-wise elucidation of the divine economy that reaches its climax at the end of Psalm 24 (element C in the pattern). The series is opened with a *Grundsatzfrage* (“axiomatic question”) concerning eligibility of access to the place of life and an answer in the form of a revelation of the will of God<sup>61</sup>. Psalm 19 develops Psalm 15 theologically by repeating the principle that obedience leads to life (vv. 8-15) and then prefixing it with a vision of creation which grounds this obedience ontologically (vv. 1-7): to be obedient is to be integrated into the greater cosmic scheme of things; the righteous Israelite participates in a divine order that is vaster than the concerns of daily life. This pattern in turn is repeated in Psalm 24: God creates a space for a primordial quality of life in vv. 1-2 that becomes uniquely accessible within the temple on condition of obedience in vv. 3-6. Already an element of deferral has been introduced; the immediacy of the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* (deed-consequence relation) has been loosened, for one must embark on a journey and climb a mountain to access it (cf. the contrast between Psalms 16 and 23)<sup>62</sup>. To this rather static correlation between Torah and creation is added the narrative, “eschatological” moment found in vv. 7-10, whereby YHWH himself enters into his created order, does battle, and then brings his righteous people to Zion, the place where the new creation will finally flourish<sup>63</sup>. Psalm 24 thus contextualizes Psalm 19 by showing that any experience of “creational blessing” in the present can only be a proleptic foretaste of a greater reality yet to come, one that can only be accessed

---

emphasis on YHWH’s militant intervention (though see Psalm 18 in the first “pane” and Psalm 23 in the second, which has no militant element!). He leaves Psalm 15 out of consideration.

<sup>61</sup> The term is used by T. PODELLA for Ps 24,3, but the same applies here. See his “Transformationen kultischer Darstellungen: Toraliturgien in Ps 15 und 24”, *SJOT* 13 (1999) 95-130; here, 125.

<sup>62</sup> Podella notes the proximity of the language in v. 3 to the Sinai epiphany in Exodus 19 (PODELLA “Transformationen”, 125).

<sup>63</sup> Psalm 24 thus contains protology (vv. 1-2) and eschatology (vv. 7-10).

with the help of an intervening divine warrior (24,7) who has to journey with his people through tribulation (Ps 23,4) before bringing them to their final place of rest <sup>64</sup>.

## V. The Coherence of Psalms 15–24

It remains to relate frame and content. We have seen that for every parallel pair in the collection there is a consistent move to embed either a theological theme (e.g. Psalms 15 and 19, ultimately within Psalm 24) or an existential situation (the remaining psalms) within a broader theological horizon that reflects the lineaments of Israel's eschatological traditions <sup>65</sup>. The conditional offer to David of life in the presence of the Lord is ultimately for the sake of another, namely his faithful people (Psalms 20–21); it is of universal significance (Psalm 22) and requires an extended period of tribulation in which the Lord himself will guide David to the place of fulfilment (Psalm 23), and in doing so consummate creation (Psalm 24) <sup>66</sup>. In the second half of the chiasm we see that David's faithful struggle is a type of the experience of the true Israel, which must imitate his obedience and share in his journey.

A further dimension is the interplay between the perspective "on the ground" in the intervening psalms and the perspective "from above", as found in the frame. If the intervening psalms, with their petitions, praises, and affirmations of confidence, are articulated within the entangled web of lived experience, Psalms 15, 19, and 24 represent moments of theological orientation, articulated above the "fray" and providing it with order. They thereby provide the broader salvation-historical perspective within which the more "existential" psalms they encompass are to be interpreted. In short, obedience to the divine will not only grant one access to the fullness of life; it is to participate within YHWH's plans for the consummation of creation.

---

<sup>64</sup> Perhaps the petition at the conclusion of Psalm 19 (vv. 12–15) prepares us for the insight that Israel needs the Lord's help, for it recognizes the inevitability of the presence of sin as a threat to the life mediated by Torah.

<sup>65</sup> For a helpful outline that resonates strongly with my thesis, see KRAUS, "Schöpfung und Vollendung".

<sup>66</sup> This pattern also reflects the structure of the Books of Samuel, in which David, by virtue of his righteousness, is the vehicle by which the Lord brings his people to the fulfilment of Deuteronomy 12 in 2 Samuel 5–8.

Beat Weber has identified a similar editorial technique in the Psalter. He describes it using a metaphor that could have been taken from the opening strophe of Psalm 24: “The wisdom-oriented editors of the Psalter have inserted, as it were, ‘pillars’ and ‘bridges’ amongst the many prayers that were (mostly) composed out of the depths of the ‘waters of chaos’. Their function is not only to process the hardships experienced within the psalms but also to master them theologically”<sup>67</sup>. Interestingly, Isaiah 33, another text that draws on the Torah-entrance liturgy found in Psalms 15 and 24, also fulfils a similar editorial function in the context of the book. Whereas the oracles that precede it are characterized by a high level of historical specificity, this chapter appears to summarize the underlying eschatological pattern in a historically decontextualized manner. In this way it links up with the historically decontextualized opening chapters, chapters 1 and 2, thereby forming an interpretive framework for the oracles that intervene<sup>68</sup>. Finally, given the significance of the figure of David for our collection, one should also note a similar structure to the Books of Samuel, which are framed by poetic texts that function to set the history within the context of the divine economy<sup>69</sup>.

## VI. Structure and Theology in Psalms 15–24

This article seeks to contribute to our understanding of the final form of Psalms 15–24 by drawing our attention to significant features of its structure and thematic arrangement and by analysing these elements in terms of Brunner-Traut’s theory of ancient “as-

---

<sup>67</sup> B. WEBER, “‘Like a Bridge Over Troubled Water ...’: Weisheitliche Wegmarkierungen im Psalter”, *Ex oriente Lux*. Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. Festschrift für Rüdiger Lux zum 65. Geburtstag (eds. A. BERLEJUNG - R. HECKL) (Leipzig 2012) 289-306; here, 290 (translation mine).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. J. GOLDINGAY, *Isaiah* (NIBC:OT; Grand Rapids, MI 2001) 185: “Setting chapters 1 and 33 around chapters 2–32 invites readers to see the message of chapters 2–32 as a particular concrete application of the more general points made in chapters 1 and 33.” This insight, shared to one degree or another by interpreters such as Childs, Seitz, Sweeney, and Blenkinsopp, goes back to an article by W. BEUKEN, “Jesaja 33 als Spiegeltext im Jesajabuch”, *ETL* 67 (1991) 5-35.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. G. STEINS, “Geschichte, die im Rahmen bleibt: Kanonische Beobachtungen an 1 Sam 2 und 2 Sam 22f”, *Der Bibelkanon in der Bibelauslegung. Methodenreflexionen und Beispielerlesen* (eds. E. BALLHORN – G. STEINS) (Stuttgart 2007) 198-211.

pective” perception. The initial observation that Psalms 15–24 consist of a chiasm sets up the framework for identifying sets of inter-psalm relationships. The theory of semantic intensification as a characteristic of biblical parallelism helps us identify a series of consistent semantic shifts between the parallel psalms within this arrangement. In short, the content of each psalm is consistently set within a more developed theological context. Finally, Brunner-Traut’s thesis that juxtaposition functions to elucidate a single reality helps us identify the presence of a single pattern underlying the diversity and thereby unifying it, namely the eschatological narrative of God’s consummation of creation by bringing his righteous king, and with him the people of whom he is a type and for whom he is a redeemer, into the reality beyond the threshold of his temple.

When read on their own as self-contained units, this theological context escapes the reader’s attention. When read with an eye for unifying thematic arrangement, however, we can begin to see how the editors of this collection perceived its fragmentary elements to cohere within a greater theological reality that encompassed their own day and age, namely the divine economy. In short, the bridge between the past and present was ontological, for it was grounded in God’s unchanging ways. If my reading holds any water, then it can help us understand the ways in which Israel’s literary heritage was shaped in order to function as scripture for future generations of the faithful. In the interplay between the framing psalms of theological orientation (Psalms 15; 19; 24) and those dominated by disorientation and reorientation (Psalms 16–18; 20–23), future readers are provided with a means for contextualizing their own faithful struggle, regardless of their shifting historical, cultural, and institutional contexts.

P.O. Box 50105  
Nazareth 16100, Israel

Philip SUMPTER

#### SUMMARY

This article develops recent arguments that Psalms 15–24 constitute a relatively self-contained sub-collection that is chiastically arranged. It seeks to uncover the logic underlying the arrangement by attending to three points: 1) the manner in which the content of each psalm is “expanded” and “brought forward” in its chiastic parallel; 2) the nature of the relation between the framing psalms (15; 19; 24) and those that intervene; 3) the significance of David and Zion. In short, it argues that the editors were concerned to situate David within his true theological context.

### The Fourth Gospel's Reversal of Mark in John 13,31–14,3

Questions regarding the Fourth Gospel's relationship with the Synoptic tradition are ancient and contentious. Over the history of biblical scholarship, the case has been made that John <sup>1</sup> wrote to supplement the Synoptic tradition (B.W. Bacon, B.H. Streeter), to displace it (Hans Windisch), or was simply unaware of it (Percival Gardner-Smith, C.H. Dodd) <sup>2</sup>. Since Gardner-Smith, the majority view has probably been the latter — John had no knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels.

More recently, Ian Mackay has made the argument that John is likely to have known and “performed” Mark <sup>3</sup>. The fourth evangelist then composed his gospel utilising this comprehensive knowledge. Obviously, Mackay is not advocating direct literary dependence as is evident in the relations between the Synoptic gospels. On the contrary, if John knew Mark, he used the tradition loosely, perhaps writing from memory.

If Mackay's thesis is held to be plausible, the significant textual and theological differences between John and Mark remain intriguing. On the basis of a critical exegesis of John 13,31–43 and comparable passages in Mark, this paper analyses the significance of the many similarities and differences between the two works. Similarities do not strongly support the hypothesis that John knew Mark, as they are probably better explained by elements of a common tradition. However, this paper demonstrates that significant Johannine differences function to reverse several key Markan themes. The reversal observed here cautiously supports the view that John was familiar with Mark and composed his Gospel in order to reverse the second evangelist's apocalyptic themes, in order to provide new answers to issues such as the delay of the Parousia and the need to persevere in suffering.

---

<sup>1</sup> In keeping with tradition, I have usually referred to the author of the Second and Fourth Gospels as ‘Mark’ and ‘John’ respectively, and used the male pronoun.

<sup>2</sup> D.M. SMITH, *John Among the Gospels* (Columbia, SC 2001) 1–37.

<sup>3</sup> I.D. MACKAY, *John's Relationship with Mark*. An Analysis of John 6 in the Light of Mark 6–8 (WUNT II 102; Tübingen 2004).



## I. John 13,31-32: "Now the Son of Man has been glorified"

Of critical importance here are the themes of "glorification" and the focus on "now" (νῦν), both of which are essential Johannine themes and emphases. Νῦν is critical here, signalling that the hour of darkness has come — through Judas' action the end has begun. In terms of the narrative, the crucifixion is still to come, but the inevitable result of Judas' action will be Jesus' death. The use of the phrase "Son of Man" here links "glory" with the imminent passion and crucifixion <sup>4</sup>. The aorist ἐδοξάσθη and the future δοξάσει are used to show this tension — it is as if, with Judas' departure, the event has already taken place <sup>5</sup>.

Further, νῦν here points to Jesus' "hour", mentioned in 13,1, wherein he is to leave this world and return to his Father <sup>6</sup>. Similarly, in 12,27 and 12,31 νῦν is linked with the "hour" when Jesus will be glorified, the time of his lifting up (or death) <sup>7</sup>. In his imminent death, resurrection and return to the Father, the mission of Jesus is being accomplished "now", rather than at the end time. In the completion of Jesus' mission, the glory of God is revealed in Jesus <sup>8</sup>. In the obedience of the Son the Father is glorified, and God's love for humankind is revealed in his offering of the Son (3,16) <sup>9</sup>. The focus in this saying is that the place where God will be revealed is in the cross, at the death of the Son <sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> So Moloney, who makes a distinction between the glorification of the Son of Man, which is the lifting up on the cross, and the glory of the Son, who returns to the Father through the cross. In making this distinction, Moloney qualifies it by stating "passion, death, resurrection and glorification all seems to be one in the Fourth Gospel" (F.J. MOLONEY, *The Johannine Son of Man* [Rome 1978] 200).

<sup>5</sup> W.R.G. LOADER, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel*. Structure and Issues (Frankfurt 1992) 54.

<sup>6</sup> C.S. KEENER, *The Gospel of John*. A Commentary (Peabody, MA 2003) 921.

<sup>7</sup> R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel According to St John* (New York 1982) III, 49. Further, Moloney indicates that the expression "Son of Man" points the reader forward to the crucifixion throughout the gospel (1,51; 3,14; 6,27.53; 8,28; 12,23); F.J. MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*. Reading John 13–21 (Minneapolis, MN 1998) 24.

<sup>8</sup> R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John* (London 1966) 606.

<sup>9</sup> G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC 36; Nashville, TN 1999) 246.

<sup>10</sup> Moloney states that "glory" has been used throughout the Johannine narrative to refer to "revelation" (MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 24).

Jesus' darkest hour on earth is, to the eyes of faith, the hour of his glorification <sup>11</sup>. This passage is rich in irony, because on the level of "the flesh" Jesus will experience ultimate shame and humiliation in his death on the cross. However, to those who perceive on the level of "the spirit", it is through the cross that Jesus completes his mission and reveals the glory and love of the Father, and returns to the glory he shared with his Father (17,5).

In Johannine thinking, there is one movement of revelation in Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension, whereby he completes his mission and returns to the Father <sup>12</sup>. "The Father and the Son, united in love, act in a reciprocity of glorification" <sup>13</sup>. The whole mission of Jesus has been a revelation of this glory, and it will reach its climax in the imminent crucifixion and resurrection. In this event Jesus will be truly lifted up, and his glorified humanity will be taken up into his Father's presence <sup>14</sup>.

Raymond Brown has suggested that this section bears comparison to eschatological strands in the Synoptic tradition, and cites the example of the Son of Man coming in the clouds in Mark 13,26 <sup>15</sup>. Indeed it is Mark 13,24-27 which presents the most obvious parallel, and it is now appropriate to turn to an examination of this passage.

### 1. *Mark 13,24-27: The glorious return of the Son of Man*

In the literary context, the Markan Jesus completes his descriptions of the tribulation and the desolating sacrilege, and then moves into this section. This is marked by the transitional "In that day", indicating a time following the terrible events he has discussed. This is the Markan pattern in the discourse — tribulation followed

---

<sup>11</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 49-50. Segovia suggests that there is a chiasmic structure, indicating that 13,31c and 32c specify the time of this glorification (cf.  $\nu\upsilon\nu$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ ); 13,31c and 32b show different aspects of Jesus' glorification and 13,31d and 32a indicate the glorification of God by Jesus — F.F. SEGOVIA, *The Farewell of the Word*. The Johannine Call to Abide (Minneapolis, MN 1991) 70.

<sup>12</sup> MOLONEY, *Son of Man*, 195.

<sup>13</sup> A.J. KELLY — F. J. MOLONEY, *Experiencing God in the Gospel of John* (New York, NY 2003) 283.

<sup>14</sup> D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1991) 483.

<sup>15</sup> BROWN, *John*, 611.

by the appearance of the kingdom of God, represented in Mark by the Parousia of Jesus. Mark draws on traditions in the OT (for example, Isaiah 13,10 [LXX]): “For the stars of heaven and Orion and all the order of heaven will not give their light”<sup>16</sup>.

The Markan Jesus describes the apocalyptic Son of Man, based on the image in Dan 7,13: “In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven”. The apocalyptic imagery of the darkened sun and moon and stars falling from the skies “provides a black curtain against which the glory of the Son of Man’s coming shines all the more”<sup>17</sup>. Angels will gather the elect, covering every corner of the world in their search for the saved<sup>18</sup>. The contrast between Jesus’ words and what will shortly occur in the narrative is very sharp. Far from coming in the clouds, Jesus will presently be betrayed and crucified. Thus, for Mark, Jesus’ revelation as the glorified Son of Man is very much an eschatological theme.

## 2. Similarities and differences

The common elements of John 13,31–33 and Mark 13,24–27 can be summarised as follows:

- The “Son of Man” motif appears in both Mark 13,26 and John 13,31, although the evangelists use the title in different ways.
- The motif of “glory” is present in both.
- The literary context in both cases is similar — Jesus’ execution looms like a shadow over both discourses. Both evangelists use this fact in order to encourage hope in the face of suffering.
- In literary terms, both discourses reach a point of climax here — John by use of the resounding “now” to indicate that glorification has begun, and Mark by indicating that the Parousia will end the time of tribulation.

---

<sup>16</sup> This passage also has marked similarities to the early first-century pseudepigraphon *Testament of Moses*. In this work, after a second punishment befalling God’s people, the kingdom of God will appear throughout his whole creation (*T.Mos.* 10,1); C.A EVANS, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34b; Nashville, TN 2001) 327, 329–330.

<sup>17</sup> R.H. GUNDRY, *Mark. A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI 1993) 744–745.

<sup>18</sup> B. WITHERINGTON III, *The Gospel of Mark. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI 2001) 348.

The elements of any common tradition appear in an altered expression, based largely on a different approach to eschatology.

a) *The Glory of the Son of Man* <sup>19</sup>

The Markan discourse contains a parousial eschatology. Everything said assumes that these events will occur after Jesus' imminent death, in the time leading up to the Second Coming. The Parousia will end the present age and usher in the Kingdom of God. Mark also links glory to the end-time. Jesus suffers the humiliation and anguish of the cross, but at the end of the age he will return as the glorious Son of Man. This represents an interpretation of the Hebrew apocalyptic tradition, in which God acts to intervene to bring about the end of the present evil age <sup>20</sup>. This action is to be completed at the point of Jesus' return.

In contrast, John represents a realised eschatology. John's focus is on the "already" rather than the "not yet". The Johannine Jesus, knowing that Judas' departure has sealed his fate, states that he is glorified now — it has begun <sup>21</sup>. John commences this discourse by showing that Jesus' glorification is taking place in the unfolding events of suffering, death, resurrection and return to the Father. Further, John portrays Jesus' humiliation, death and resurrection as one sweeping movement of glory. God's action of revealing salvation and judgment through the Son is completed not in a future coming, but at the point on the cross where Jesus states "It is finished" (19,30) <sup>22</sup>. The focus is not, as in Mark, on a future vision of the Son of Man coming with the clouds, because the glorification is happening now.

---

<sup>19</sup> "The noun 'glory' is used repeatedly in the Synoptics in connection with the title Son of Man, although in these cases the context is the coming of this eschatological figure at the end of time. It appears, then, that the allegedly "Johannine" formula at John 13,31-32 in fact resonates with a number of features in the broader Jesus tradition" (J. BEUTLER, "Synoptic Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Farewell Discourse", *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition* [eds. R.T. FORTNA — T. THATCHER] [Louisville, KY 2001] 165-173).

<sup>20</sup> As Moloney indicates, the apocalyptic imagery in Mark is not literal, but should be read as a concrete prophecy of the end of the world as we know it (F.J. MOLONEY, *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary* [Peabody, MA 2002] 266).

<sup>21</sup> This is paralleled in Mark 14,41, where the Markan Jesus states "The hour has come" in reference to his betrayal by Judas (BEUTLER, *Synoptic Jesus*, 171).

<sup>22</sup> MOLONEY, *Son of Man*, 196.

### *b) Hope and Suffering*

This fundamental difference in eschatology relates to application. As both narratives move toward the passion of Jesus, the problem of suffering in the Christian community is a key concern. Mark's answer to the problem of suffering is the Parousia. The message is straightforward — although you may suffer now, just as Christ suffered, you can look forward to a time of glory and vindication, when there will be no more suffering. The vindication of the suffering faithful will affirm the power and justice of God in the eschaton<sup>23</sup>.

The message to Mark's readers is that suffering is not God's final word; there will ultimately be a reversal of the crucifixion<sup>24</sup>. Those who endure the tribulation are the elect, who will be gathered to the Son of Man at the end of time. Immediately prior to the passion of the Messiah, the Olivet Discourse points forward, past the suffering of Jesus in his death to the eschatological glory of the Parousia.

John's message is more difficult to understand, as the problem of suffering cannot be neatly dealt with by stating that the coming glory of Christ will end suffering. John states that in the midst of suffering Jesus abides with his followers. Jesus represents the hope of the faithful community, who patiently endures suffering understanding that they are following Jesus along the path to glory. Thus, both Mark and John contain calls to endure in obedience, but for subtly different reasons. For Mark, those who endure to the end will be saved at the Parousia. For John, those who obey "follow" Jesus through suffering and death to glory. In Johannine thinking, in the midst of obedience those who follow experience the presence of Jesus among them, mediated by their love for each other and for God.

### *3. Assessment and implications*

Having examined the elements of common thought and tradition, as well as the different expressions of these by the two evangelists, we turn now to the question: can these similarities be explained by John's use of Mark? If so, what would the differences indicate about Johannine emphases?

---

<sup>23</sup> J.R. DONAHUE – D.J. HARRINGTON, *The Gospel of Mark* (Collegeville, MN 2002) 380.

<sup>24</sup> GUNDRY, *Mark*, 745; W.L. LANE, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids, MI 1974) 447.

As we have seen, Mark 13,24-27 has a significant function in Markan eschatology, as it explicates the eventual vindication of the elect and the commencement of the kingdom of God. In the same context (a farewell discourse), using the same broad motifs of glory and the Son of Man, the fourth evangelist has constructed a narrative which serves Johannine theology and purposes. John's eschatology here is the opposite of what we find in Mark. The glorification and final revelation of Jesus, and of God in him, takes place at the point of the crucifixion/resurrection/return to the Father. Is it possible that John has taken the elements of the Markan pericope and effected a reversal, bending these elements to serve his own purposes? Differences according to this hypothesis are not necessarily problematic, but they could constitute evidence of Johannine reconstruction.

Further, it is not simply a possible reversal in thought that is in evidence here. The description of the Parousia occurs where it does in Mark, toward the end of the eschatological discourse, precisely because the appearance of Christ follows the tribulation. This forms the climax of the passage and the climax of history. Conversely, in John, this parallel section is positioned at the beginning of the Final Discourse. For John, the climax of history is occurring in the outworking of the narrative, as Jesus walks the path toward death and returns to the Father. The Johannine Jesus begins with glorification, and then goes on to talk of the suffering his followers will face after his departure, because the world hates them (14,15-17; 16,2-3.32-33; 17,14).

If we consider that John was familiar with the Markan material and order, it would follow that he may have reversed the order in which the material was placed in order to turn the emphasis on its head. This would mean that John was deliberately bending the elements of the story in order to present a different eschatology. He would also be writing with the agenda of imposing a different answer to the problem of suffering, perhaps an answer more in line with a community coming to terms with a delayed Parousia <sup>25</sup>. Under this hypothesis, John would be reinterpreting the Markan tradition to emphasise the realised nature of Jesus' eschatology, re-locating the locus of hope from the future to the present, possibly to give an existential answer to the problem of suffering.

---

<sup>25</sup> Beasley-Murray is prepared to concede that John 13,31-14,31 is a reinterpretation of the Church's traditional hope in the Parousia (BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 244). It is fair to say, however, that Beasley-Murray is suggesting a par-

#### 4. *Summary*

The common motifs of glory and the Son of Man, coupled with a clear correlation in the context of a farewell discourse, may constitute evidence of a connection here between Mark and John. The emphatic and almost enigmatic nature of Jesus' words in John 13,31-33 suggests that John is aware of Mark or of a similar tradition, and writes deliberately to reverse this. This reversal in thought, placed alongside the apparent reversal in order between the two passages, suggests that John may have known Mark and written deliberately to reverse the Markan emphasis.

#### II. John 13,33-38: A new commandment, and the prediction of Peter's denial

This is a critical verse in the discourse, as elements from this saying are expanded throughout the Final Discourse<sup>26</sup>. For John, the motif of discipleship is expressed in the analogy of "following" Jesus, or doing what Jesus did: making the Father known. Jesus is about to commence the final stage of this journey, which will see him complete this mission and return to the Father through his death and resurrection. Reference is made here to earlier points in the narrative where Jesus said to the Jews: "You will seek me... and where I am going you cannot come" (7,34; 8,21). Like the Jews, Jesus' disciples cannot understand the true significance of who Jesus is and where he is going<sup>27</sup>.

However, Jesus does not tell his disciples that they will never find him or follow him (which is exactly what he tells "the Jews"). The disciples cannot follow Jesus on this "way" (14,6) now, but they will participate in the mission of Jesus. The children<sup>28</sup> will find him as they obediently "follow" Jesus on the "way" of reveal-

---

allel of motif, rather than Johannine dependence on Mark or 1 Thessalonians (G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *Jesus and the Future* [London 1956] 237-238).

<sup>26</sup> LOADER, *Christology*, 59; SCHNACKENBURG, *John, III*, 52-53.

<sup>27</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 25.

<sup>28</sup> The use of τέκνία here is appropriate, since what follows is a farewell discourse, which is often set in the context of a dying father instructing his children (BROWN, *John*, 611).



ing God to the world, and subsequently pass through death <sup>29</sup> and be reunited with Jesus in his Father's house (14,2-3). Jesus' own resurrection will be the guarantee that his disciples also will live after death (14,19).

Thus 13,33 provides a thought structure to the material which follows, as these themes appear throughout the Farewell Discourse. Any tradition John may be working from would be adapted to the thought structure introduced in this verse.

Jesus calls his followers to show love for each other in the same way he has displayed it to them <sup>30</sup>. It seems likely that this relates back to Jesus' display of love for his disciples in the foot washing (13,1) <sup>31</sup>, and also forward to the imminent passion <sup>32</sup>. When he leaves and they cannot follow him, they are "to repeat the love of Jesus and thus render present the lifestyle of Jesus" <sup>33</sup>. The phrase ἐντολὴν καὶνὴν appears in the Johannine epistles (1 John 2,7; 2 John 5), and this command of Jesus is a major theme in 1 John (3,1.23; 4,21) <sup>34</sup>. For the Johannine community, the words of Jesus represent a new revelation, a distinct emphasis <sup>35</sup> — the command "love your neighbour as yourself" (Lev 19,18b) becomes here "love one another as I have loved you".

Jesus' followers do not merely render present the lifestyle of Jesus by showing love; they render present his lordship. In the same way Jesus has revealed his Father through his love for them and the world, so his followers will reveal the true God through their love for each other <sup>36</sup>. Though it is not possible to follow Jesus physically, his disciples can continue to "follow" him by embodying the love which he showed to them. In the section which follows, Peter totally misunderstands the true meaning of following Jesus.

---

<sup>29</sup> KEENER, *John*, 923.

<sup>30</sup> KELLY – MOLONEY, *Experiencing God*, 286.

<sup>31</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 25.

<sup>32</sup> KEENER, *John*, 924.

<sup>33</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 25-26.

<sup>34</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 53. Schnackenburg suggests that this may be an editorial addition, perhaps by the author of 1 John, or a member of the Johannine community.

<sup>35</sup> W.R.G. LOADER, *Jesus and the Fundamentalism of his Day* (Grand Rapids, MI 2001) 133-134. Keener also points out that Jesus does not appeal to the Decalogue here, but gives one commandment that will define his community (KEENER, *John*, 925)

<sup>36</sup> CARSON, *John*, 485; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 248.

Peter's question returns to the journey motif introduced in 13,33. Peter has misunderstood the true meaning of Jesus' words. He is thinking of an ordinary — if dangerous — journey, from one place to another, whereas Jesus is referring to his return to the Father. Jesus does not directly answer the question at this point; the answer will come in 14,2, when Jesus tells the disciples that he is going to make preparations for them in the Father's house. John inserts traditional material concerning Peter's denial here and reworks it to expand and explain 13,33<sup>37</sup>. Following Jesus unto death is part of discipleship when necessary, but the point here is that it may prove more difficult than might be expected<sup>38</sup>.

Jesus' prediction, then, is that Peter will be thwarted by his own ignorance<sup>39</sup>. The irony of Jesus' reply, "Will you really lay down your life for me?", is that Peter will indeed eventually follow his Master and lay down his life (21,18-19)<sup>40</sup>. The message to the community is that those who fail yet return and persevere remain disciples<sup>41</sup>.

We now turn to the two parallels in Mark. Individually, Mark 12,28-34 and 14,27-31 do not appear to present strong evidence of a connection. However, when the parallel passages are examined together, the weight of evidence presents a more compelling case for John's possible use of Mark. We begin with some exegetical comments on Mark 12,28-34.

### 1. *Mark 12,28-34: The first commandment*

Mark 12,28-34 forms a unit, featuring the interplay between the scribe and Jesus. Debate over the "first" (most important) commandment was common in Jewish circles<sup>42</sup>, and thus it is hardly surprising that an impressed scribe would take the opportunity to ask Jesus this question. In the Markan tradition<sup>43</sup>, Jesus cites Deut 6,4-5 as the most

<sup>37</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 55.

<sup>38</sup> KEENER, *John*, 928.

<sup>39</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 26.

<sup>40</sup> LOADER, *Christology*, 55.

<sup>41</sup> KEENER, *John*, 929.

<sup>42</sup> DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 354.

<sup>43</sup> Matt (22,34-40) and Luke (10,25-29) have similar pericopes, although significant differences make the issue of relationship problematic. Probably there were several traditions in circulation, and Luke and Matt reflect these.

important commandment, and Lev 19,18 as the second commandment. The sympathetic scribe draws the conclusion, based on Jesus' statement, that love for God and one's neighbour is superior to all burnt offerings and sacrifices. This fits well with Markan thinking, since for Mark the elements of the temple cult did not matter at all <sup>44</sup>.

## 2. *Mark 14,27-31: The prediction of Peter's denial*

In Mark, this pericope appears after the disciples have eaten the Passover with Jesus and have gone out again to the Mount of Olives (14,26), just prior to entering Gethsemane. The Markan Jesus quotes Zech 13,7 in support of his startling claim that his followers will desert him <sup>45</sup>. The scattering of the sheep is in sharp contrast to the prediction of 13,27, in which the angels will gather the elect. The scattering is not the last word, however, as the Markan Jesus indicates that following his resurrection he will "go before" them, evoking the image of a shepherd guiding a flock <sup>46</sup>.

In Mark, the irony is very sharp, as Peter makes his claims and not long after is found asleep as Jesus is praying. This is also a very sharp contrast with Jesus' exhortation to be watchful, which is the recurring admonition in Mark 13. Mark's purpose for this pericope is to show the shortcomings of Jesus' followers <sup>47</sup>. The dialogue opens with Jesus' prediction that the disciples will stumble because of him, and this is borne out in the events of Gethsemane. These legendary first followers failed, but they would be given a second chance. Thus Mark offers a "pedagogy of hope" to all subsequent followers of Jesus <sup>48</sup>. The elect may stumble, but it is endurance to the end that counts (13,13).

---

(EVANS, *Mark*, 262.) In contrast, Loader theorises that Matt and Luke have edited Mark to fit their own purposes (LOADER, *Fundamentalism*, 91, 110).

<sup>44</sup> LOADER, *Fundamentalism*, 48.

<sup>45</sup> The word σκανδαλισθήσεσθε is translated "be scandalised" by Brown (R.E. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*. From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels [New York 1994] 117). Evans notes the word is commonly used in the Greek New Testament to refer to stumbling (EVANS, *Mark*, 400).

<sup>46</sup> MOLONEY, *Mark*, 288.

<sup>47</sup> MOLONEY, *Mark*, 287-288.

<sup>48</sup> BROWN, *Death of the Messiah*, 141.

### 3. *Similarities and Differences*

We now turn to consider the elements of common thought and tradition in the three pericopes, while noting the different expressions in each. The common elements across the three pericopes can be summarised as follows:

- Both John 13,34–35 and Mark 12,28–34 contain instruction from Jesus upon the theme of “commandment”. The central focus of the teaching is love. In both, there is the impression that Jesus’ teaching surpasses the old order and points to the new order of the Kingdom of God.
- The journey motif in John 13,33–38 and Mark 14,28 (In Mark Jesus goes before his disciples; in John they are to “follow” him).
- The prediction of Peter’s denial (John 13,36–38 and Mark 14,29–31).

We will now evaluate these similarities in turn.

#### a) *Commandment*

The motif of “commandment” is certainly present in both John 13,34–35 and Mark 12,28–34. However, there are several differences between the two pericopes. Firstly, the setting is very different in both accounts. For John, this pericope is placed in the Final Discourse, where Jesus is passing on instructions to his disciples prior to his imminent departure. Mark, on the other hand, places this pericope earlier. Jesus has been disputing in the temple courts with the scribes and Pharisees, and gives this teaching in response to a question from a sympathetic scribe.

The content of Jesus’ teaching also contains significant differences when the accounts are compared. John’s “I have loved you” moves in the opposite direction of Mark’s “Love the Lord your God”<sup>49</sup>. The foundation of the command to love others is also different: in Mark the measure of love for a neighbour is the extent to which an individual loves him or herself, whereas in John the measure of the love a disciple must show for another is Jesus’ own love for his disciples<sup>50</sup>. The new commandment in John is given concrete expression by Jesus’ washing the feet of his followers, and thereafter by his passion.

---

<sup>49</sup> Beutler suggests that the Johannine formulation may represent an earlier stage of a common Jesus tradition (BEUTLER, *Synoptic Jesus*, 168).

<sup>50</sup> KEENER, *John*, 924.

Also, the instruction to love “one another” in John may be a more exclusive idea than the Markan reiteration of the command to love “your neighbour”<sup>51</sup>. Finally, Jesus’ reply to the scribe in Mark is a re-statement of commands contained in the OT. John in contrast has Jesus stating a “new commandment”, not based on anything but Jesus’ own authority as the one who has come from the Father.

However, it is clear from the scribe’s reply and Jesus’ affirmation of him that Mark understood the teaching of Jesus and the new community inaugurated by him to represent the beginning of a new order. The system of sacrifice and the temple establishment were of no further importance. They were superseded by the simple command to love God and others, restated by Jesus here. Further, the theme of love is clearly central to both teachings. The significance of these similarities will be assessed in the next major section, but now we turn to the motif of following Jesus.

*b) “Go before you” and “Follow me”*

Mark states that Jesus will “go before” his disciples into Galilee. This is clearly a reference to post-resurrection meetings with the disciples, after which the ministry of Jesus is to continue. Galilee is a key location in Mark: “the promise of a post-resurrectional meeting in Galilee is the promise of a new mission”<sup>52</sup>.

In John, the motif of following Jesus, introduced at 13,33, is pursued and expanded throughout the Final Discourse. The language of 13,33 is Johannine, as it provides a structure of thought for the evangelist to place other material within the discourse. Whatever John’s source may have been, it seems likely that the prediction of Peter’s denial has been cleverly edited to expound this theme. The following motif is not a reference here to a physical meeting after the resurrection, but to the spiritual process of walking the same path as Jesus did, making God known and revealing the love of God for the world by being willing to die in order to reveal this love. The journey is complete when Jesus and his followers are reunited in heaven.

---

<sup>51</sup> KEENER, *John*, 925-926. Keener notes that John does not contradict the Synoptic tradition here, but is more focused. He rejects the claim that John is “violently” exclusionary, but simply expressing the need for internal cohesion in the Johannine community.

<sup>52</sup> DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 402.

Clearly, there are important differences between the thoughts of the two evangelists. There are also some commonalities which may point to a similar starting point. In both evangelists, the motif is connected to mission. As has been pointed out, the meeting in Galilee for Mark is the commencement of a new mission. In John, the disciples continue the work of Jesus after his return to the Father. For both evangelists, the mission involves doing what Jesus did — proclaiming the gospel in Mark (13,10); doing the works of Jesus in John (14,12-14).

*c) Prediction of Peter’s denial*

We now turn to the prediction itself. The table below compares John 13,37-38 and Mark 14,29-30 side by side. Luke 22,33-34 and Matt 26,33-34 are also included, completing the fourfold tradition. In the comparison that follows, identical textual agreements between John and Mark are represented by a solid underline. Where the two evangelists use the same root words, this is represented by a broken underline. John’s agreements with Luke are represented by a rippled underline <sup>53</sup>.

*The prediction of Peter’s denial in the fourfold tradition*

Mark 14,29-30	John 13,37-38
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ· εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγώ. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἀμὴν λέγω σοι</u> ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτη <u>τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα</u> <u>φωνῆσαι</u> <u>τρὶς με</u> ἀπαρνήσῃ.	λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω. ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; <u>ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω</u> <u>σοι</u> , οὐ μὴ <u>ἀλέκτωρ</u> <u>φωνήσῃ</u> <u>ἕως</u> οὗ ἀρνήσῃ <u>με</u> <u>τρὶς</u> .
Matt 26,33-34	Luke 22,33-34
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι. ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι <u>τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ</u> με.	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ ἔτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ <u>ἕως</u> <u>τρὶς</u> με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι.

<sup>53</sup> Agreements between Matthew and Mark and Luke and Mark have not been noted, as such an analysis falls outside the scope of this paper. Similarly,

Mark alone in the fourfold tradition has the cock crowing twice. The second evangelist also specifies that the cock will crow both “today” and “this very night”<sup>54</sup>. Mark also records a rebuttal from Peter. John records this as an “Amen, amen” saying of Jesus, one of 25 in the Fourth Gospel<sup>55</sup>. John alone stipulates that the denials will take place before the next cockcrow. Although John does not contain the rebuttal by Peter found in Mark (and Matt), he does report Peter’s willingness to “lay down his life” prior to Jesus’ prediction<sup>56</sup>. The language here is almost certainly Johannine<sup>57</sup>.

While there are obvious similarities in content, the differences between Mark and John are significant. As Brown notes, if John knew Mark, he has changed the Mount of Olives to “across the Kidron valley” (18,1); has placed the scandal motif in the context of the Final Discourse (16,1) and the scattering motif in 16,32; has changed “after my resurrection ... go before you” to “follow me later” in 13,33.36; and placed the Peter prediction in the Final Discourse and reworded it. Brown argues from this evidence that John did not use Mark, but both drew on a similar early tradition<sup>58</sup>.

While it is difficult to draw any conclusions, Schnackenburg concludes that the fourth evangelist “clearly” made use of a tradition related to Luke<sup>59</sup>. However, it is clear that there are some close similarities between the formulation of the prediction in both the Markan and Johannine accounts (noted above)<sup>60</sup>. Further, agreements between Luke and John do not negate the possibility that

---

agreements between Matthew and John are not noted as it is assumed they are attributable to Matthew’s use of Mark.

<sup>54</sup> Possibly Matthew and Luke have simplified this in their accounts (BROWN, *Death of Messiah*, 136)

<sup>55</sup> The ἀμήν is always doubled in John. It seems that in all the gospels, ἀμήν adds a sense of solemnity to what follows (BROWN, *Death of Messiah*, 137).

<sup>56</sup> Luke 22,33 also has Peter indicate his willingness to go to “prison or death”.

<sup>57</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 55.

<sup>58</sup> BROWN, *Death of the Messiah*, 143. However, this would not negate the overall thesis that John knew Mark. Luke knew and used Mark, yet the second evangelist differs sharply from Mark at this very point, perhaps utilising another tradition.

<sup>59</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 56.

<sup>60</sup> It could be argued that, apart from the use of πρίν, John’s formulation more closely resembles Mark than Luke.



John was familiar with Mark but did not compose his gospel with Mark in front of him. Neither does the possibility that John utilised other sources negate this possibility <sup>61</sup>.

#### 4. *Assessment and implications*

It is now appropriate to assess the similarities we have noted, considering the possibility of John's use of Mark. We will also consider what Johannine adaptations or reversals may tell us about the emphases of the fourth evangelist.

As we have noted, John in 13,34 is staking a claim to a "new" commandment. This may suggest that John is deliberately not drawing on other material here, but making a unique contribution. We have also noted that the commandments have marked similarities. Of particular significance is the centrality of love. Mark has two commandments — love for God and love for others. Conversely, John has one — love for others based on the love of Jesus.

If we assume John had knowledge of Mark, we could account for this by stating that John may have reworked Mark, reinterpreting it for his own purposes. Such a reworking is not impossible, as for the Johannine community it is Jesus himself who is the foundation of ethics and not the Hebrew Bible. Also, as we have noted, the Johannine version may be an improvement of the tradition found in Mark, giving the command a concrete reality in the love Jesus shows for his disciples. If John is making use of Mark here, it is understandable that he would represent this as a new commandment, pointing to the commencement (at Jesus' glorification) of the new order, but also indicating that this saying of Jesus goes a step further than that represented by Mark.

Secondly, we must consider the question: is it possible John has picked up from memory the Markan saying relating to Jesus "going before" his followers, transformed the language and reversed the em-

---

<sup>61</sup> Dodd's observation, "All this looks less like conflation of sources than the kind of variation which arises without deliberation within an oral tradition", does not exclude the thesis that John may have written from a memory of Mark, using what suited and transforming what did not, but not depending on the text of Mark in the same way as Luke and Matt (C.H. DODD, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge 1963] 55).

phasis<sup>62</sup>? There are two major points against this proposition. Firstly, there are only two references to “going before” in Mark in relation to Jesus’ resurrection. The phrase does not form part of a major theme in the Markan narrative, as do “glory” or “the Son of Man” in Mark 13,24,27. It is difficult to see why John would reverse the emphasis of what he could hardly have regarded as a major thrust of Markan Christology or eschatology. Secondly, “following Jesus” is a major — if not the major — motif in the first Final Discourse. The language, emphasis and thought are so obviously Johannine that it is difficult to imagine another source being used.

Conversely, we can hypothesise that John picked up the phrase from Mark and reversed the emphasis, moving away from the action of Jesus “leading” his disciples and putting the focus on the disciples’ action of “following” Jesus, in order to expound the theme of discipleship. A stronger case for this proposition could be made if it can be shown that John may have known and used the prediction of Peter’s denial in Mark, as the following motif recurs in the Johannine prediction. If John has reworked the Markan prediction to include this motif, it is possible that he borrowed the original idea from Mark and reworked it.

Having said this, we now turn to the prediction of Peter’s denial. As we have already seen, if significant evidence of similar content exists, differences can be attributed to different purposes<sup>63</sup>. The prediction functions in Mark to illustrate the shortcomings of the disciples, but also to offer hope to the post-resurrection community, struggling with the issue of denial in the midst of persecution. In contrast, John has borrowed the story from Mark or at least a common tradition in order to illustrate the disciples’ inability to follow Jesus now, but that they will follow and be reunited with their Lord later. Adapted in this way, the story worked to comfort the Johannine community, who understood themselves as those following Jesus in the aftermath of the resurrection. Thus both narratives are comforting in similar ways, but are composed for different communities.

---

<sup>62</sup> Brown suggests this parallel, but does not regard it as evidence of dependence (BROWN, *Death of the Messiah*, 143).

<sup>63</sup> “The structure of the pericope depends in each Gospel on a somewhat different conception of the situation, and no one of them could readily be derived from another” (DODD, *Historical Tradition*, 56). Against this we might suggest the possibility that it is the difference in agenda and perception which accounts for the differences in content and context.

The question remains as to whether or not John has used Mark or tradition common with Mark. This cannot be conclusively answered from the evidence. What can be stated is that the evangelists have similar overall purposes in using the prediction. The differences in language and positioning in John can be explained by his desire to use the story to illustrate 13,33. Given the evidence of other elements common to both narratives, we can say that it is possible that John knew the pericope from Mark and repositioned and reworded it to suit his own purposes.

We have examined evidence of three motifs common to Mark and John: teaching on commandment; following after Jesus; and the prediction of Peter's denial. Each taken alone does not constitute strong evidence of John's use of Mark, as similarities can be explained in other ways. However, taken together they constitute much stronger evidence of a possible connection, and therefore the fact that all three motifs are present in both evangelists is significant. Assuming John has made use of Mark, differences could be explained as deliberate changes made by John for his own purposes. The case can be made for a reasonable possibility, but no stronger claim can be made at this point.

### III. John 14,1-3: *The Father's House*

The Johannine Jesus makes his devastating prediction concerning Peter and then moves on immediately to an exhortation, stated in the plural to the entire group. It forms an *inclusio* with verse 27. The distress in view is the imminent, violent departure of Jesus. In the midst of the terror that will soon engulf them, Jesus' exhortation is to stop allowing their hearts to be in turmoil, and to keep on believing<sup>64</sup>. The link between the Father and Jesus is a consistent theme in John. The disciples are urged to cling to their faith in God and by doing so also continue to believe in Jesus, who is one with his Father (14,10-11)<sup>65</sup>.

The narrative works to inspire faith, as Jesus gives his followers a reason to continue trusting in the midst of turmoil. Jesus' departure means that he can return to his Father's house and prepare it for his

---

<sup>64</sup> BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 249.

<sup>65</sup> SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 59.

disciples. This statement functions as an answer to Peter's question, "Where are you going?" in 13,36a, as well as indicating that the departure is in the disciples' interest <sup>66</sup>.

The term "my Father's house" poses some interesting questions. The simplest explanation is that the phrase refers to "heaven" <sup>67</sup>, where the redeemed dwell together with God after death. Beasley-Murray settles on this meaning, qualifying that for John the meaning is wholly "unapocalyptic" (as such images are developed in Rev 21,9–22,5), but rather eschatological <sup>68</sup>. "My Father's house", then, would refer to where Jesus is returning — to the glory he shared with his Father before creation (17,5). This is also the final destination of the disciples.

There is also precedent in the Fourth Gospel for associating the phrase τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς with the temple <sup>69</sup>. In the cleansing of the temple in 2,16, Jesus orders those selling doves out, saying μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου. Further, John alerts the reader that the temple destruction sayings in 2,19–22 were actually references to Jesus' own death <sup>70</sup>. By using the phrase in 14,2 the evangelist gives it an expanded meaning: the earthly temple built by Herod and destroyed in 70 CE, points to the union of Jesus and his followers together with the Father forever in the afterlife. This will be made possible because of Jesus' fulfilled mission of revealing the Father's glory <sup>71</sup>.

Having departed in order to prepare a place for his followers in heaven, he will return in order to take them to himself. This is a theme so little mentioned in the Fourth Gospel that it seems almost out of character with the rest of the discourse. Beutler argues that 14,2 presents John's eschatological reinterpretation of the earthly sanctuary in Jerusalem of Psalms 42/43, arguing that John's contemporaries

<sup>66</sup> SEGOVIA, *Farewell*, 83.

<sup>67</sup> CARSON, *John*, 489; L. MORRIS, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 567.

<sup>68</sup> BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 249.

<sup>69</sup> KEENER, *John*, 932.

<sup>70</sup> BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 41; MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 34. See also KELLY – MOLONEY, *Experiencing God*, 288.

<sup>71</sup> Similarly, the Johannine Jesus makes it clear in his conversation with the Samaritan woman (4,21–24) that worship of God is not confined to a particular location (i.e. the temple in Jerusalem), but exists outside the realm of space in the realm of spirit.

were reinterpreting the Psalter's temple texts in this way post 70 CE <sup>72</sup>. He continues that John is most likely drawing on a tradition of Jesus coming on the clouds of heaven — which links neatly to the Markan account <sup>73</sup>. Beutler is concerned to leave the question of John's eschatology to 14,15–31, where John's appropriation of the 'coming on the clouds' tradition can be contextually understood in line with the evangelist's more realised eschatology <sup>74</sup>. Keener is more forthright, stating that John 14,1–3 does not present a future eschatology. He bases his argument on the succeeding context, which emphasises a present dwelling of Jesus and the Father with the disciples (14,23) <sup>75</sup>.

In agreement with Beasley-Murray, Morris and Brown <sup>76</sup>, I maintain that it is best to read 14,3 as a reference to the Parousia, in which Jesus will return in order to take his followers to where he dwells with the Father. There is a reiteration of this statement in verse 28, as the two sayings function as an *inclusio* in the discourse. The tension the evangelist maintains between end-time and realised eschatology is evident here in the awkward combination of the present tense (πάλιν ἔρχομαι) and the future (παραλήμψομαι) <sup>77</sup>. The return is the last of all things, when the goal is completely realised: Jesus' followers are reunited with their Master in his Father's presence forever. This union will be distinct from the mode of Jesus' abiding spiritual presence with them through his Spirit and in their love for each other. There is a physical communion implied here. This represents an eschatology awaiting consummation.

At the same time, an inaugurated eschatology is presented in which Jesus remains with his followers as they remain in him <sup>78</sup>, obeying his commands by showing love for one another. Following Jesus, then, is the path before the disciples, with the Parousia at the end of the journey. Given that the Johannine community was dealing with the delay of the Parousia <sup>79</sup>, it is not surprising that this theme is secondary

---

<sup>72</sup> J. BEUTLER, *Do not be afraid*. The First Farewell Discourse in John's Gospel (Frankfurt am Main 2011) 35.

<sup>73</sup> BEUTLER, *Do not be afraid*, 39.

<sup>74</sup> BEUTLER, *Do not be afraid*, 44; 49.

<sup>75</sup> KEENER, *John*, 932. Likewise SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 62.

<sup>76</sup> BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 250; MORRIS, *John*, 568; BROWN, *John*, 626.

<sup>77</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 34.

<sup>78</sup> MOLONEY, *Glory not Dishonor*, 34–35.

<sup>79</sup> J. PAINTER, *The Quest for the Messiah*. The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community (Edinburgh 1993) 420.

in the discourse. Greater emphasis is placed on following Jesus through death to glory, representing a more existential concern for the community.

The interpretation of 14,3 remains a contentious issue in scholarship on John's Farewell Discourse. It is difficult to come to a firm conclusion, and in regard to the theme of this paper such firmness is not crucial. If John knows and is using Mark, either he has retained the Parousia tradition or he has reinterpreted it in line with his own eschatology.

Beasley-Murray remarks that this saying represents a promise of the Parousia, but in more "homey" language than that contained in Mark 13,24-27 and 1 Thess 4,15-18<sup>80</sup>. The first of these passages, the Markan Parousia, offers further evidence for this study.

### 1. *Mark 13,24-27: The elect gathered*

An overview of Mark 13,24-27 has already been presented in this paper. The key features of this text in comparison to John 14,1-3 are:

- The Parousia, described in Mark with apocalyptic flourish and grandeur.
- The gathering of the elect in Mark 13,27.

In this passage, the apocalyptic coming of the glorified Jesus signals the end of suffering for the elect, who are gathered by angels from the four winds, representing a reversal of Zech 2,6 ("for I have spread you abroad like the four winds of heaven"). For Mark, the Parousia represents the fulfilment of the prophecy found in Deut 30,4. Jesus achieves a task assigned to God in the prophecy<sup>81</sup>, indicating the scope of this vision — Jesus' glory and authority is to be equated with that of God himself<sup>82</sup>. Thus Jesus' coming here truly establishes the Kingdom of God.

The gathering of the elect in verse 27 is the climax of this description. The elect are rescued from persecution as the present age draws to a close<sup>83</sup>, and they are gathered together to participate in

---

<sup>80</sup> BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 250.

<sup>81</sup> DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 375.

<sup>82</sup> EVANS, *Mark*, 329.

<sup>83</sup> MOLONEY, *Mark*, 267.

the Kingdom of God, which the majestic Son of Man will rule <sup>84</sup>. There is no mention of the elect returning to heaven with Jesus to dwell with him and the Father forever. Rather, the opposite occurs — Jesus comes to where his people are and dwells with them as ruler of the earth, the location of the Kingdom of God.

## 2. *Mark 13,1-2: The destruction of the temple*

The other Markan parallel to be drawn to John 14,1-3 relates to the phrase “My Father’s House” in 14,2. As we have noted, John connects this phrase with the temple in his Gospel, and may be alluding to this meaning in 14,2. The theme of the temple’s destruction is critical to Mark’s Olivet Discourse.

Mark 13,1-2 immediately follows the pericope of the widow’s offering (12,41-44), which reflects a negative view of the temple and the cult which force every last cent out of the poor widow. This negative tone is carried into the beginning of chapter 13, wherein Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple. The destruction of the temple occurred in 70 CE, probably before the composition of Mark’s gospel <sup>85</sup>. Jesus’ prediction functions in Mark as a judgment on the temple establishment and an announcement of the punishment <sup>86</sup>.

The massive Herodian temple covered one-sixth of the space of the city <sup>87</sup>. Certainly it must have seemed magnificent to the group of disciples from Galilee. The unknown disciple’s observation may have been simply that of an awestruck tourist, or perhaps the remark was made in eager anticipation of taking possession of these buildings once the Kingdom of God arrived in fullness <sup>88</sup>. In the discourse that follows, Jesus expounds the true coming of the Kingdom of God, the judgments on the institutions that oppose it, and the suffering the disciples must endure before the consummation of the plan of God. The Markan Jesus presents a new hope, in which suffering and persecutions by temporal powers will be ended by the Parousia.

---

<sup>84</sup> G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *Jesus and the Last Days*. The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse (Peabody MA 1993) 432.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. DONAHUE – HARRINGTON, *Mark*, 368; EVANS, *Mark*, 298-299.

<sup>86</sup> LOADER, *Fundamentalism*, 46, 48-49; EVANS, *Mark*, 285.

<sup>87</sup> WITHERINGTON, *Mark*, 342-343.

<sup>88</sup> EVANS, *Mark*, 298.



### 3. *Similarities and Differences*

The common elements of John 14,1-3 and Mark 13,24-27 and 13,1-2 are identified as follows:

- Jesus himself relates to his followers what will happen.
- Jesus was to leave (implied in Mark, explicit in John), but he would one day return.
- When he returned, he would take to himself a faithful group. This group was to expect his return and to live according to his teachings in the interim.
- The enigmatic motif of “My Father’s house”, the heavenly dwelling Jesus will take his followers to, appears in John. Mark reports Jesus’ predicting the destruction of the temple. In both evangelists, this theme is connected to the return of Jesus.

We will examine 1 through 3 under the broad heading “The Return of Jesus”. Following this, we will discuss the way in which the two evangelists use the temple and “My Father’s house” in the narrative.

#### *a) The Return of Jesus*

The Parousia is central in both John 14,3 and Mark 13,24-27. However, the two evangelists describe this event in very different ways. The Markan language is apocalyptic. Mark emphasises the epoch-ending advent of the Son of Man, who comes to display his glory and to vindicate himself and his followers. The consummation of the Kingdom of God, ruled by the exalted Son of Man, is the climax of the discourse. The gathering of the elect is significant in that the elect will participate in the new Kingdom.

In contrast, John 14,3 is bare of any apocalyptic references. The glorification of Jesus, and thus the commencement of God’s glorious reign, takes place for John in the cross/resurrection/return to the Father, and thus does not await future fulfilment. The Parousia, on the other hand, is a future event for John, but it is described in simple language as a reunion, emphasising the simple fact that Jesus and his followers will be together. This is the ultimate goal for John <sup>89</sup>: it is this reunion which makes the Parousia significant.

---

<sup>89</sup> LOADER, *Christology*, 55.

The differences in approach point to the differing intentions of the two evangelists. Prior to Mark 13,24, Jesus predicts a time of great tribulation that is to precede the Parousia. The focus of the discourse is on future events, after Jesus' own death and resurrection. Conversely, the Johannine Jesus exhorts his followers not to be troubled (14,1.28) in the context of his imminent passion. John's Jesus gives his disciples the assurance of the Parousia as he is about to ascend to the cross. For both evangelists, the promise of the Parousia is intended to be comforting — but for different primary reasons. In Mark, the Parousia will end the suffering of the elect. In John, the Parousia will end the separation which Jesus and his followers have had to endure, which began at the cross. In contrast, later in the discourse, the fourth evangelist reasserts a more fully realised eschatology in Jesus' predictions that he will "come to" his disciples at Easter (4,18-24).

*b) "My Father's House" and the Temple*

The other motif which warrants examination is the possible connection between Mark's reference to the temple and John's "My Father's House". For both Mark and John the focus of the discourse is not the temple. Mark simply uses the prediction of the temple's destruction as a jumping off point to discuss the events leading up to the end of the age. John does not mention the temple at all in this context. We have noted, however, that John connects the phrase "My Father's House" with the temple in 2,16. From this we can infer that whatever else may be meant by the phrase, "my Father's house" in John 14,2 describes the spiritual dwelling of the Father, to which Jesus is returning. This "temple" is more significant than the Herodian temple, as it will never pass away.

The most obvious distinction between the two evangelists is that Mark 13,1-2 is talking about tearing a place down and John 14,2 about preparing a place. The Markan Jesus is announcing judgment on the temple and the scribes who oppress widows and make a show of piety (12,38-44). Further, synagogues together with kings and nations will persecute Jesus' followers, and in announcing the temple's destruction the Markan Jesus points to the fact that these institutions are temporary. Mark urges his readers to look beyond the destruction of the temple, to place their hope in the coming Kingdom of God, and to remain faithful in the midst of suffering<sup>90</sup>. In that kingdom, their suffering will be brought to an end.

---

<sup>90</sup> WITHERINGTON, *Mark*, 341.

In presenting the image of Jesus preparing a place in the Father's house for his followers, John reveals a different understanding. The real dwelling of God is not of this world, but is spiritual. Those who follow Jesus, pursuing the mission of revealing him to the world as he revealed the Father, have the hope of being reunited with him. The real house of God is for those whom Jesus will take with him at the end, and so it is eschatological and not of the present age <sup>91</sup>. John goes one step further than Mark to state that, beyond the destruction of an earthly temple, beyond suffering and death, Jesus' followers will dwell together with him and the Father forever in the afterlife.

#### *4. Assessment and Implications*

Having observed the similarities and differences between the two evangelists, it is now appropriate to assess these similarities considering the possibility of John's use of Mark. Once again, we will speculate concerning what the differences may tell us about the emphases of the fourth evangelist.

The Parousia is the central theme of Mark 13,24-27 and the climax of the Markan Olivet Discourse. For Mark, this return is important in that it ends the suffering of the elect and signals the commencement of the Kingdom of God. As we noted in commenting on John 13,31-33, the fourth evangelist uses the same motif of the Parousia to fashion a narrative which functions within John's thought and purposes. It is not the commencement of the Kingdom of God or the cessation of suffering which is of primary importance here, but the fact that Jesus and his followers will be reunited once again.

If we assume that John is using Mark, there is a reversal of thought evident. For Mark it is the Parousia which makes the gathering of the elect significant. Conversely in John it is the reunion which gives the second coming significance. It is possible that John has taken the Markan Parousia motif and modified it to bring out

---

<sup>91</sup> Loader indicates that Mark also proposes the idea of a spiritual temple, formed by the community of believers, an uncorrupted house of prayer for all people (LOADER, *Fundamentalism*, 46-47). This would mean the church becomes the spiritual temple, which is still very different from John's view of the Father's house as heaven.

what for him was the crucial point — Jesus coming back means that where he is, his followers may be also.

This would account for the absence of apocalyptic language, as John would be trying to refocus the pericope on this reunion rather than on the Parousia in itself. This may also explain the apparent reversal in structure here. John's Jesus commences in 14,1-3 discussing his return, moves into talking about the interim period, and then mentions the return again in verse 27-28 by way of *inclusio*. Mark's does the reverse, relating the sayings regarding the interim period in 13,1-23, leading up to the climactic description of the Parousia in 13,24-27.

We turn now to the motif of temple and "My Father's House". If we assume that John knows Mark here, he has reinterpreted Jesus' saying from a reference to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE to a more generic comfort in troubled times. This makes sense if it is assumed that John writes at a time considerably after 70 CE. The unmistakable implication of Mark is that the Parousia will soon follow the destruction of Jerusalem. By removing any reference to the temple and spiritualising the motif, John is perhaps attempting to sever the connection in the Markan tradition between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia. John's vision is different: the promise of reunion in "My Father's house" does not signal the end of history in the way described by Mark<sup>92</sup>. John 14,2 refers to life and union with God and Jesus after death in the resurrection which is the hope of the suffering Johannine community.

The fact that both John and Mark expound the motif of the Parousia in the context of the final discourse, coupled with significant common elements, suggests the possibility of a connection between the accounts. Examination of the differences can be explained by the different thought of John, who may have modified the common elements in the Markan account accordingly. Taken with the apparent reversal in order between the two passages, these constitute a significant argument in favour of John's possible knowledge of and dependence on Mark.

A possible connection between the motifs of the temple's destruction in Mark and John's "Father's house" is more difficult to establish. It is possible that John has picked up the Markan reference to

---

<sup>92</sup> KELLY – MOLONEY, *Experiencing God*, 289.

the destruction of the temple and transformed the motif entirely to point to a spiritual dwelling place. The argument is strengthened when we consider the common elements we have already observed between John 14,1-3 and Mark 13,24-27. However, the language and emphasis of the two evangelists are too different to make a strong case.

\*            \*

\*

Indeed, taken separately the pericopes would provide very flimsy evidence of anything, as apparent textual similarities (for instance in the prediction of Peter's denial) could be explained in other ways. My thesis rests on the cumulative force of common motifs in all the sections outlined above. This, together with evidence of a possible reversal of the apocalyptic tendencies of Mark executed by John, provides the basis of the claim that John knew and used Mark.

No more definitive statement can be made about what is, after all, an ancient bone of contention. If John knew Mark as theorised here and "flipped" the tradition to reverse the direction of Markan eschatology — from the "not yet" to the "already" — this would be a fascinating glimpse into the way a community knew and made use of the Jesus tradition. Inevitably, this raises possibilities for how believing communities may use the tradition today.

Murdoch University  
Australia

Mark JENNINGS

## SUMMARY

I argue that the author/s of the Fourth Gospel knew Mark, based on the reversal of certain Markan themes found in John. No attempt is made here to suggest the kind of literary dependence which is the basis of the Synoptic problem. Rather, my thesis is that the author/s of John may have used Mark from memory, writing deliberately to reverse the apocalyptic tendencies found in the Second Gospel. Isolated incidents of this possible reversal demonstrate little, but this paper proposes that the cumulative force of many such reversals supports the thesis of John's possible knowledge of Mark.

## **“Las profundidades de Dios” en 1 Corintios 2,10 y Romanos 11,33 <sup>1</sup>**

El tesoro de los significados divinos está encerrado dentro del frágil vaso de la letra común. Pero si alguno más curioso pidiera una explicación de ciertos detalles, que venga y oiga con nosotros cómo el apóstol Pablo, escrutando el abismo de la sabiduría y ciencia divinas (*altitudinem divinae sapientiae ac scientiae*), por medio del Espíritu Santo que incluso escudriña las profundidades de Dios (*profunda Dei*; 1 Co 2,10), y aun así incapaz de alcanzar el final y llegar, por así decirlo, a un conocimiento íntimo, exclama con desesperación y asombro (*desperatione rei et stupore*) y dice: “¡Oh abismo de las riquezas de la sabiduría y de la ciencia de Dios!” (*O altitudo divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei*; Rm 11,33). Y que proclamó esto en la desesperación de alcanzar la comprensión perfecta se nota en lo que dice: “¡Cuán inescrutables son sus juicios e intrazables sus caminos!” (Rm 11,33). En efecto, él no dijo que difícilmente se puedan escrutar los juicios de Dios, sino que no se pueden de ninguna manera; ni dice que difícilmente se puedan trazar sus caminos, sino que no se pueden trazar en absoluto ... ORIGENES, *De Principiis* 4.3.14 (en H. CROUZEL – M. SIMONETTI [eds.]: *Origène, Traité des Principes* [SC 268; Paris 1980] III, 392-393; traducción mía).

En este bello pasaje del cuarto libro del *Peri archôn*, el primer tratado cristiano sobre la Sagrada Escritura, Orígenes glosa los sentimientos del apóstol cuando escribe Rm 11,33-36. Según el alejandrino, Pablo exclama “con desesperación y asombro” (*desperatione rei et stupore*, según la traducción de Rufino, única versión conservada). Exclama “con asombro” debido a la admirable riqueza de la sabiduría divina y “con desesperación” porque es imposible para el hombre comprender sus designios. Orígenes aduce como pruebas escriturísticas que apoyan su argumentación — ¡argumentación que busca paradójicamente demostrar que es imposible conocer los secretos de la Escritura! — dos pasajes paulinos: 1 Co 2,10b (“el Espíritu todo lo sondea

---

<sup>1</sup> Esta investigación es el fruto de la ampliación y revisión de una comunicación presentada al III Congreso Internacional de Biblia, “Los rostros de Dios en la Biblia” que ha organizado la Asociación Bíblica Española en Sevilla (3-5 Septiembre 2012).

[ἐραυνᾶ], hasta las profundidades de Dios [τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ]”) y Rm 11,33 (“¡Oh profundidad [βάθος] de riqueza de la sabiduría y ciencia de Dios! ¡Cuán insondables [ἀνεξεραύνητα] son sus juicios e inescrutables sus caminos!”).

Orígenes, gran conocedor de la Escritura, escoge en su *inventio* los dos únicos pasajes paulinos en los que la metáfora de la “profundidad” (βάθος) se asocia al léxico de ἐραυνάω, que indica en 1 Corintios la capacidad que posee el Espíritu de sondearlo (ἐραυνάω) todo; y, en Romanos, la incapacidad humana de sondear (ἀν-εξε-εραύνητος) los juicios divinos. Prueba de que el alejandrino tiene en cuenta dicha correspondencia es el pasaje que cita a continuación: Ecl 7,23-24, en el que βάθος también expresa la limitación humana ante la sabiduría: “Todo esto intenté con la sabiduría, dije: «seré sabio», pero ella se alejó de mí, más lejos de lo que estaba, como un gran abismo (βαθὺ βάθος), ¿quién podrá hallarlo?”.

En el presente ensayo estudiaremos la metáfora de la “profundidad” en 1 Co 2,6-16 y Rm 11,25-36. ¿Existen correspondencias entre los dos pasajes? ¿Cuáles son los rasgos semánticos de la metáfora y cómo funcionan retóricamente en la argumentación? ¿Qué “velan” y qué “revelan” las “profundidades divinas”? En primer lugar, es interesante constatar que, aunque son ciertamente distintos, los dos pasajes comparten muchos términos específicos:

1 Co 2,6-16	Rm 11,25-36
βάθος (1 Co 2,10) <sup>2</sup>	βάθος (Rm 11,33)
ἐραυνάω (1 Co 2,10)	ἀνεξεραύνητος (Rm 11,33)
μυστήριον (1 Co 2,7)	μυστήριον (Rm 11,25)
σοφία (1 Co 2,6bis.7.13)	σοφία (Rm 11,33)
νοῦς (1 Co 2,16bis)	νοῦς (Rm 11,34)
γινώσκω (1 Co 2,8bis.11; 2,14.16)	γινώσκω (Rm 11,34), γνώσις (Rm 11,33)
συγκρίνω (1 Co 2,13), ἀναγκρίνω (1 Co 2,14.15bis)	κρίμα (Rm 11,34)
δόξα (1 Co 2,7.8)	δόξα (Rm 11,36)
αἰών (1 Co 2,6bis.7.8)	αἰών (Rm 11,36)

<sup>2</sup> βάθος aparece 5 veces en el epistolario paulino, cf. SCHLIER, “βάθος”, *TDNT*, I, 517-518. Aparte de 1 Co 2,10 y Rm 11,33, el término es empleado en Rm 8,39 y Ef 3,18, enumeraciones en las que designa la hondura opuesta



Además, Pablo recurre en los dos textos a Is 40,13 LXX, cita que no vuelve a aparecer en sus cartas:

1 Co 2,16	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;
Rm 11,34	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

Las correspondencias son de tal calibre que invitan a aventurar la hipótesis de que Pablo compuso Rm 11,25-36 a partir de una matriz de ideas y términos que ya había elaborado conceptualmente en 1 Co 2,6-16. Volveremos a ello. A continuación, intentaremos probar que Pablo asocia βάθος en los dos textos al campo semántico del conocimiento.

## I. La profundidad y el conocimiento

El apóstol explicita en 1 Co 2,6 la temática de su argumentación: “hablamos de una *sabiduría* entre los perfectos”. Tras mostrar en 1,18-2,5 la necesidad de la sabiduría mundana y el contenido de la sabiduría divina —el anuncio del Mesías crucificado—, él va a hablar en 2,6-16 acerca de la naturaleza y el acceso a dicha sabiduría. Nótese que la mayoría de verbos y objetos de la sección hasta el v. 10, en el que aparece la metáfora de “las profundidades”, pertenece al campo semántico del conocimiento: “Hablamos una sabiduría (σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν)... una sabiduría no de este mundo...; hablamos una sabiduría de Dios (λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν)... la cual Dios destinó... la cual ninguno de los jefes... conoció (ἐγνωκεν), pues de haberla conocido (ἐγνωσαν) ...” La cita del v. 9, sea cual sea su origen <sup>3</sup>, incide en la temática del conocimiento, oculto para algunos y prometido a otros: “lo que el ojo no vio, lo que el oído no oyó, ni al corazón del

a la altura (cf. Is 7,11; *Diog.* 7.2). En 2 Co 8,2 funciona como intensificador de la pobreza de los macedonios: ἡ κατὰ βάθος πτωχεία.

<sup>3</sup> H. D. WILLIAMS, *The Wisdom of the Wise*. The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor 1:18-3:23 (AGJU 49; Leiden – Boston, MA 2001) 157-208, propone que Pablo cita aquí Is 64,3 y alude a Is 65,17. Cf. también J. P. HEIL, *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* (SBL 15; Boston, MA – Leiden 2005) 53-67; y B. L. GLADD, *Revealing the Mysterion*. The Use of *Mystery* in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians (BZNW 160; Berlin – New York, NY 2008) 133-150.

hombre llegó, es lo que Dios preparó para los que lo aman”. En el v. 10a, el apóstol omite el objeto directo: “Pero a nosotros Dios [lo] reveló por el Espíritu”. El contexto deja claro que lo que Dios ha revelado se refiere a lo que el ojo no vio ni el oído oyó, lo que los jefes de este mundo no han conocido, lo que, en cambio, Dios sí ha preparado para los que lo aman, esto es, la sabiduría oculta en el misterio de la que se ha estado hablando. A continuación, dicho contenido omitido pero muy presente en el razonamiento recibe una nueva conceptualización. Se dice del Espíritu, revelador de esta sabiduría, que lo sondea todo, incluso lo más escondido y recóndito, la extremidad de dicha sabiduría: “las profundidades de Dios” (1 Co 2,10b). Por tanto, el sintagma de “las profundidades de Dios” (τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ) conecta directamente con la “sabiduría de Dios” (θεοῦ σοφία) de los versos anteriores. En síntesis, Pablo emplea en 1 Co 2,10 la metáfora de las profundidades como correlato de un objeto de conocimiento.

La asociación de βάθος con el campo semántico del conocimiento también es explícita en Rm 11,33. El nominativo βάθος aparece acompañado de cuatro genitivos: “Oh profundidad de riqueza (πλούτου) de sabiduría (καὶ σοφίας) y ciencia (καὶ γνώσεως) de Dios (θεοῦ)”. Aunque hay varias alternativas exegéticas, la más plausible a nivel semántico agrupa βάθος πλούτου a modo de endíadis<sup>4</sup> (“riqueza insondable”, “profundidad riquísima”), y καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ como atributo del sintagma anterior que, también en endíadis, ofrece dos términos para ensalzar la sabiduría divina<sup>5</sup>. Más aún, los dos sintagmas βάθος πλούτου y καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ funcionan como una macro-endíadis en la que el primer elemento engrandece la magnitud (“riqueza insondable”) del segundo, que aporta el contenido del atributo divino, su sabiduría y ciencia, que superan toda medida. La temática del conocimiento seguirá presente en el v. 34: “¿quién conoció (ἔγνω) la mente (νοῦν) del Señor?”.

El elogio de la sabiduría divina de Rm 11,33-36 responde a lo dicho en Rm 11,25 (ἄγνοεῖν; μυστήριον). Nótese que lo que es en-

<sup>4</sup> J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38b; Dallas, TX 1988) II, 699: “The combination of the two metaphors (depth and riches) jars at first, but increases the force of the imagery (a treasury which has no bottom)”. Cf. βάθος en 2 Co 8,2 también con función superlativa.

<sup>5</sup> Sigo aquí a R. PENNA, *Lettera ai Romani*. Rm 6-11 (SOrC 6; Bologna 2007) II, 391. Esta interpretación tiene a favor la correlación de los dos καί (tanto ... cuanto ...), que conectan los dos términos sinónimos sabiduría y ciencia.

salzado en Rm 11,33 no es la misericordia, lo que hubiera sido de esperar, ya que en los versículos inmediatamente precedentes Pablo ha tratado de la misericordia divina que ha llegado inesperadamente a los gentiles a través de la desobediencia de Israel y que también puede llegar al pueblo elegido. En cambio, el apóstol no amplifica en Rm 11,33-36 la misericordia sino la sabiduría divina, inaccesible al conocimiento humano —por eso la categoría de *μυστήριον*—, pero dada a conocer por revelación. Más adelante volveremos sobre la relación entre *βάθος* y *μυστήριον*, ahora baste con reparar en que la metáfora de las profundidades aparece en los dos textos en relación al conocimiento.

Pablo no es original al emplear *βάθος* como metáfora de conocimiento. Dicha conexión semántica era ya tradicional. Greenstein ha probado que las antiguas culturas semitas habían pensado la sabiduría a partir de dos modelos conceptuales: la sabiduría está arriba en los cielos y abajo en las profundidades de la tierra. Los dos modelos son correlativos ya que concuerdan en que la sabiduría está situada lejos del alcance del hombre y habita en ámbitos donde no viven los mortales, ámbitos divinos <sup>6</sup>.

Por ello, Sofar de Minean puede replicar a Job a propósito de su ansia de sabiduría: “¿Encontrarás tú las huellas del Señor (*ἵχνος κυρίου*)”? ¿alcanzarás los extremos que hizo el omnipotente? El cielo es alto ¿qué harás? Hay cosas más profundas de las que están en el Hades (*βαθύτερα τῶν ἐν ᾧδου*). ¿Qué sabrás?” (Job 11,7; cf. Ecl 7,23-24). O un salmista puede exclamar lleno de admiración: “¿Cuán grandes has hecho tus obras, Señor, y qué inmensamente profundos (*ἐβαθύνθησαν*) tus pensamientos!” (Sal 91,6).

La metáfora no solo pertenece al ámbito de la creación, también alcanza los abismos del corazón: “el corazón es más profundo (*βαθεῖα*) que todas las cosas, así es el hombre, ¿quién podrá conocerlo?” (Jr 17,9; cf. Prov 20,5). El corazón humano es tan “profundo” porque es imposible para otro hombre “conocer” sus secretos <sup>8</sup>. Asi-

<sup>6</sup> Cf. E.L. GREENSTEIN, “The Poem on Wisdom in Job 28 in Its Conceptual and Literary Context”, *Job 28. Cognition in context* (ed. E. J. van WOLDE) (BIS 64; Leiden – Boston, MA 2003) 253-280, esp. 254.

<sup>7</sup> Pablo emplea la misma raíz en Rm 11,33 para aseverar que los caminos de la sabiduría “no se pueden trazar” (*ἀν-εξ-ιχνίαστος*).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Jdt 8,13-14, donde “la profundidad del corazón del hombre” (*βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου*) es algo imposible de conocer por parte de Jabrís y Jarmís, ancianos de Israel.

mismo, Filón emplea con frecuencia el término βάθος para adjetivar el vocabulario del conocimiento: él habla de “las profundidades de la ciencia” (τοῦ βάθους... τῆς ἐπιστήμης: *Poster. C.* 130; cf. *Somn.* 2.271) o dice de la “sabiduría” (σοφία) que es “profunda y nada superficial” (βαθεῖα καὶ οὐκ ἐπιπόλαιος: *Ebr.* 112)<sup>9</sup>.

En síntesis, Pablo se inserta en una tradición que emplea con soltura βάθος en el ámbito del conocimiento. Pero ¿con qué matices específicos enriquecen la metáfora las argumentaciones de 1 Co 2 y Rm 11?

## II. Matices de la profundidad: limitación humana e inmensidad divina

La metáfora de la profundidad referida al conocimiento en 2 Co 2,10 y Rm 11,33 alterna dos rasgos semánticos. Por un lado, tiene el poder de evocar algo oculto, oscuro, remoto e impenetrable, una especie de región o ámbito en el que los humanos difícilmente pueden vivir. Este matiz subraya la limitación humana ante la sabiduría divina<sup>10</sup>. Por otro, las “profundidades” remiten a la inmensidad de algo gigantesco — y por tanto inaprehensible — pero, por lo mismo, verdaderamente fascinante. Este segundo matiz resalta la grandeza de aquello que aparece vasto y abismal, la ciencia divina, y, por tanto, muy apropiado a la hora de expresar la revelación del misterio.

a) Primer matiz: Pablo emplea βάθος para subrayar la limitación humana. El apóstol subraya en 1 Co 2,9-10 el contraste entre la imposibilidad del hombre (“ni su ojo... ni su oído... ni su corazón”) y la revelación divina (“Dios nos [lo] ha revelado por el Espíritu”). Lo que es imposible para las fuerzas humanas se hace viable gracias al don divino. Ya hemos notado como en el v. 10a se omite el objeto directo: ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Esta omisión es retóricamente oportuna: le permite a Pablo resaltar con viveza la cualidad de la dádiva divina. En esta frase no importa tanto el objeto sino el hecho de que Dios (lo) “haya revelado por medio de su Espíritu”. Se-

<sup>9</sup> También en el griego profano aparece la asociación entre “profundidad” y “conocimiento”. Sócrates, por ejemplo, tiene miedo de no comprender las palabras de Parménides, sin poder atisbar su “profundidad” de ciencia (βάθος... ἐπιστήμης: PLATÓN, *Theaet.* 183e-184a).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. BDAG, “βάθος”, 162 § 2: “something nonphysical perceived to be so remote that it is difficult to assess”.

guidamente él explica (γάρ) este hecho. El Espíritu puede ser el instrumento divino de revelación porque lo “escruta todo” (τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐραυνᾷ). El indefinido πάντα incluye cualquier objeto de conocimiento. También aquel que está más allá del dominio humano. Precisamente eso es lo que aclara Pablo a continuación. El Espíritu escruta *incluso* las profundidades de Dios: καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 10b). La conjunción καί posee aquí valor ascendente o intensivo: “también, incluso, hasta” las profundidades de Dios <sup>11</sup>, el ámbito último, el extremo de lo que (ya no) puede ser conocido. Las “profundidades de Dios” evocan, por tanto, aquellas regiones imposibles de conocer por parte del hombre si no es en virtud del auxilio divino.

Varios textos de la LXX aluden a este lugar remoto en el que — intuyen — reside la quitaesencia de la sabiduría: Prov 8,28.29; Eclo 24,5; Bar 3,15.31. Sin duda el pasaje más interesante al respecto es Job 28,1-28. El poema describe el trabajo en las minas y admira la capacidad técnica del hombre que llega a desentrañar los tesoros del fondo de la tierra (28,1-11). Lo que los animales no conocen — ni siquiera el león alcanza (v. 8) — es posible para el hombre que “desvela (ἀνεκάλυψεν) las profundidades de los ríos (βάθη ποταμῶν)” (v. 11). Y, sin embargo, aunque el ser humano llega adonde no alcanza ninguna criatura, el sabio debe reconocer resignado: “¿Dónde se encontró la sabiduría (σοφία)? ¿cuál es el lugar del conocimiento? El mortal no conoce su camino, no hay manera de encontrarla entre los hombres” (vv. 12-13). La sabiduría está más allá — o más profundo, por continuar con la imagen de Job — de las posibilidades humanas.

En Rm 11,33-36, el apóstol también evoca la limitación humana a través de la metáfora de la profundidad. Pablo abunda en la idea con dos adjetivos, “insondables ... inescrutables (ἀνεξεραύνητα [...])

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. BDB § 442.8a. Dicho valor de καί es evidente en 1 Co 13,1-2: Ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων [hablar las lenguas de los ángeles es *más* que hablar las lenguas de los hombres], ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω [...] καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα [conocer todos los misterios es *más* que tener el don de profecía]. Cf. 2 Co 12,15. Por otro lado, H. MERKLEIN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Kapitel 1-4 (ÖTK 7/1; Gütersloh – Würzburg 1992) I, 235-236, nota que la expresión debe ser comprendida desde la óptica humana: las extremas “profundidades de Dios” no indican tanto la capacidad del Espíritu de conocer el ser divino en sí (en formulación de Rahner, ámbito de la Trinidad inmanente), sino el rol del Espíritu en tanto que revelador a los hombres de la sabiduría divina (ámbito de la Trinidad económica).

ἀνεξιχνίαστοι)”, que refuerzan la impresión de inaccesibilidad. Si los juicios de Dios no se pueden sondear — el verso comparte raíz con 1 Co 2,10 — de los caminos de Dios ¡ni siquiera se puede encontrar el rastro (ἵχνος)! Tanto los dos adjetivos como las citas y alusiones bíblicas (Is 40,13; 55,8; Job 15,8; 41,3; Jr 23,18) del texto conectan Rm 11,33-36 con la tradición sapiencial que resaltaba la limitación humana al conocer los secretos del mundo y de Dios <sup>12</sup>. Nótese, además, que si bien el adjetivo ἀνεξεραύνητος no vuelve a aparecer en la Biblia griega, el otro término, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, solo retorna en la LXX en textos sapienciales que abundan en la misma idea: Job 5,9; 9,10; 34,24; Odas 12,6.

¿Por qué Pablo aduce en los dos pasajes una metáfora que resalta los límites cognoscitivos del hombre? ¿Cómo podía este matiz servir retóricamente a sus respectivos intereses persuasivos? En 1 Co 1,18–2,16, el apóstol ha relativizado el poder y la gloria de la sabiduría mundana. La necedad de Dios, manifestada en el anuncio del Mesías crucificado, ha resultado ser más sabia que los hombres (1 Co 1,25). Lo profetizado en la Escritura, “destruiré la sabiduría de los sabios” (Is 29,14; 1 Co 1,19), se ha realizado en la predicación de la cruz. Con ello, Pablo desautoriza la actitud de aquellos corintios que se gloriaban del propio conocimiento — quizás por medio de la disputa acerca de la sabiduría de sus líderes —. Su supuesta sabiduría, madurez y altura espiritual se habían revelado, por el fenómeno de las discordias, como una pretensión necia, infantil y carnal. Por ello, Pablo ni siquiera les puede ofrecer alimento sólido (1 Co 3,1-2). Y, en el marco de esta situación retórica, resultaba muy apropiado aducir una metáfora, la de “las profundidades de Dios”, en la que se resaltara la limitación humana. Con ella quedaba claro que si los corintios llegaban a acceder a los abismos de la sabiduría

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. 2 Bar 14,8-9, muy cercano a Rm 11,33-36: “¿Pero quién, oh Dueño y Señor, es capaz de comprender tu juicio? ¿Quién hollará tu profundo camino? ¿Quién podrá investigar tu sendero honorable? ¿Quién podrá imaginar tu pensamiento incomprensible? ¿Quién de los nacidos podrá encontrar el principio o el fin de la sabiduría?” Trad. de F. del RÍO SÁNCHEZ – J.J. ALARCÓN SAÍNZ, “Apocalipsis siríaco de Baruc”, *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (eds. A. Díez Macho † – A. Piñero) (Madrid 2009) VI, 188. Por su parte, N. RICHARDSON, *Paul's Language about God* (JSNT.S 99; Sheffield 1994) 84-86, nota que los dos textos, sin embargo, tienen perspectivas distintas. Mientras que 2 Baruc posee un tono angustiado y triste, Pablo culmina Romanos 9–11 de modo admirado y gozoso.

no sería gracias a sus fuerzas propias, sino solo en virtud del don divino. La metáfora, consiguientemente, colabora con la intención persuasiva general de la argumentación que busca solucionar las discordias de los corintios cambiando su mentalidad de fondo <sup>13</sup>.

Aunque Romanos 11 posee un tono menos polémico y más positivo, en él Pablo también busca evitar una posible actitud orgullosa entre sus destinatarios. Es interesante notar que el vocabulario del gloriarse, tan habitual en 1 Corintios 1–2 (καυχάομαι: 1,29.31bis; cf. 3,21), reaparece en Romanos 11: el acebuche gentil no debe gloriarse (κατακαυχάομαι: 11,18bis; cf. 11,20) ante el olivo judío. Si él ha sido injertado, es por gracia divina. Asimismo, antes de revelar el contenido del misterio, Pablo introduce un aparte que busca evitar el peligro del orgullo: “para que no presumáis de sabios” (ἵνα μὴ ᾔτε [παρ'] ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι: Rm 11,25). Los gentiles que ahora disfrutaban de la misericordia divina deben abrirse sin presunción al venturoso destino de Israel, revelado en el misterio. Nadie podría haber imaginado que Dios hubiera dispuesto un designio tan paradójico: “Dios encerró a todos en la desobediencia para tener misericordia de todos” (11,32). De ahí el himno de alabanza a la profundidad de la sabiduría y ciencia divinas. De ahí, también, el que dicho himno albergue, por medio de la metáfora de la profundidad, el matiz de la limitación humana, rendida humilde y agradecidamente ante la inescrutabilidad de sus sendas, y precabida ante toda pretensión orgullosa <sup>14</sup>.

En síntesis, el uso metafórico de βάθος colabora con otros términos en los dos pasajes para mostrar que los creyentes, tanto corintios como romanos, deben reconocer sus límites ante la sabiduría divina y deben evitar el peligro del orgullo consiguiente.

b) Segundo matiz: Pablo evoca con βάθος la inmensidad de la sabiduría divina. La metáfora acoge en los dos textos otro matiz:

<sup>13</sup> Sigo en este análisis a C.W. STRÜDER, *Paulus und die Gesinnung Christi*. Identität und Entscheidungsfindung aus der Mitte von 1 Kor 1–4 (BETHL 190; Leuven 2005).

<sup>14</sup> J. GUNDRY, “«Or who gave first to him, so that he shall receive recompense?» Divine Benefaction and Human Boasting in Paul and Philo”, *The Letter to the Romans* (ed. U. SCHNELLE) (BETHL 226; Leuven 2009) 25–53, ha demostrado, en el marco de las convenciones antiguas del honor y el patronazgo, que Rm 11,35 (“¿Quién le dio primero, para que le fuera recompensado?”) subraya la libertad de la gracia de Dios que evita el orgullo de los gentiles ante los judíos de dentro y fuera de la comunidad romana.



las “profundidades” no solo son inaccesibles, también fascinan por su inmensidad y riqueza. Y, aunque el hombre no pueda abarcarlas, sabe que hay alguien que sí puede: Dios. Por ello Job reconoce: Dios puede “revela[r] la profundidades de las tinieblas”<sup>15</sup> y trajo a la luz la sombra de la muerte” (12,22). Este segundo matiz es útil a Pablo para resaltar el carácter grandioso y divino de la sabiduría revelada en 1 Co 2,6-16 y amplificada en Rm 11,33-36.

¿Hay rastros en los textos de dicho matiz? En 1 Co 2,10, el apóstol lo deja entrever con la formulación en plural: τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ. El plural colabora a dar la impresión de grandeza y vastedad. El ámbito recóndito que solo pertenece a Dios es amplio, son “profundidades” inmensas. Pablo recurre al plural amplificador en otros pasajes. Por ejemplo, el plural τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ de Rm 3,2 —que no reaparece en las cartas, mientras que el singular sí es frecuente (Rm 9,6; 1 Co 14,36; etc.)— debería ser interpretado como un plural amplificador que busca mostrar cuán grande ha sido “la ventaja del judío” (Rm 3,1) que ha recibido “las palabras” u “oráculos” divinos<sup>16</sup>.

En Rm 11,33, Pablo evoca el matiz de la inmensidad por otros medios. A nivel sintáctico, ya la acumulación de cuatro genitivos sugiere la riqueza del concepto. A nivel semántico, “riqueza” (πλοῦτος) forma parte del mismo campo semántico<sup>17</sup>. Por último, a nivel retórico, el matiz de la grandeza es subrayado por medio del tono grandilocuente del pasaje que comienza con una rara forma exclamativa: es el único caso en el que Pablo emplea la interjección ὦ con el nominativo, y no con vocativo<sup>18</sup>. Además, la acumulación de términos,

<sup>15</sup> El léxico de βάθος aparece frecuentemente junto al de la oscuridad (con σκότος: Job 12,22; Is 29,15; Dn 2,22; JOSEFO *Ant.* 1.27; 2.308; con ζόφος: FILÓN, *Imm.* 1.46), de ahí que las profundidades se asociaran simbólicamente con lo oculto (cf. 1 Co 2,7-10), lo inquietante (cf. Rm 8,39) o lo misterioso (cf. *infra* la conexión entre βάθος y μυστήριον).

<sup>16</sup> También en Rm 1,20, Pablo ha aludido a “las cosas invisibles de Dios” (τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ); en Rm 12,1 a “las misericordias de Dios” (διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ); en Ga 4,3 a los “elementos del mundo” (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου); o en 1 Co 10,11, a “la(s) plenitud(es) del tiempo” (εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν). Estos plurales aportan un matiz amplificador digno de ser tenido en cuenta en la exégesis.

<sup>17</sup> Ya la Atenea de Sófocles advierte a Odiseo contra la arrogancia y el orgullo porque otro podría mostrarse más fuerte o “en profundidad de amplia riqueza” (μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει: SÓFOCLES *Aj.* 130).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. PENNA, *Romani*, II, 391.

las preguntas retóricas y las citas bíblicas contribuyen a colorear el pasaje del mencionado tono amplificador.

Desde el punto de vista retórico, el matiz de la riqueza e inmensidad evoca en 1 Corintios la grandeza de la revelación divina que han recibido los creyentes (“pero a nosotros lo ha revelado Dios por el Espíritu”). La revelación del Espíritu puede llegar a ser tan admirable porque Él escruta incluso las “profundidades de Dios”. Lo imposible para el hombre le ha sido graciosamente regalado. Así dirá Pablo explícitamente en el v. 12: “Y nosotros no hemos recibido el espíritu del mundo, sino el Espíritu que proviene de Dios, para que sepamos lo que Dios nos ha concedido (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν)”. Las “profundidades de Dios” son, además de ignotas, un don rico e inmenso. En Rm 11,33, el matiz de la riqueza contribuye a conferir un tono noble y elevado al pasaje que funciona como *peroratio* de Rm 9,1–11,36<sup>19</sup>. Aquí βάθος es aducido para alabar la grandiosidad del sabio designio divino que ha escogido vías desconcertantes. En suma, en los dos textos las “profundidades de Dios” son, además de ignotas, un don rico, grandioso e inmenso.

Finalmente, quizás se deba pensar que la *inventio* de la “profundidad” cambia de énfasis en cada texto. Mientras que en 1 Corintios 2 se subraya con la metáfora la limitación humana ante la sabiduría divina — sin que por ello el matiz de la grandeza de lo revelado desaparezca — en Romanos 11, resalta más el matiz de la riqueza que se suma a otros elementos para configurar un espléndido himno laudatorio a la sabiduría divina desplegada en la historia de la salvación.

### III. Profundidad y misterio

En las dos argumentaciones Pablo aduce βάθος (1 Co 2,10; Rm 11,33) después de haber usado μυστήριον (1 Co 2,1.7; Rm 11,25). En mi opinión, el apóstol emplea conscientemente el segundo término en cada texto como variación semántica del primero.

<sup>19</sup> Así J.-N. ALETTI, *La lettera ai Romani e la Giustizia di Dio* (Roma 1997) 56-57; y J. D. KIM, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles. Rhetoric and situation in Romans 9–11* (SBL.DS 176; Atlanta, GA 2000) 139-142; en contra, PENNA, *Romani*, II, 390. En cualquier caso, es evidente que Rm 11,33-36 corona la argumentación sobre el destino de Israel, en inclusión con el exordio (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν: Rm 9,5; 11,36).

Varias razones apoyan esta hipótesis. A nivel semántico, tanto βάθος como μυστήριον comparten rasgos de sentido: su carácter oculto y oscuro, la fascinación que despiertan, su conexión con el ámbito de la sabiduría, el reconocimiento humano de la propia limitación tanto ante los misterios como ante las profundidades.

En segundo lugar, a nivel tradicional, μυστήριον y βάθος ya habían sido relacionados en la tradición apocalíptica <sup>20</sup>. El mejor ejemplo de la tradición procede de las versiones griegas de Daniel. Tras la petición de Daniel y sus amigos, el narrador comenta que el misterio del rey le es revelado al joven (2,19; LXX TH: τὸ μυστήριον ἀπεκαλύφθη; LXX O: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξεφάνθη). Seguidamente Daniel eleva a Dios una bendición en la que reconoce su sabiduría (2,20: σοφία), su dominio sobre los tiempos (αἰών) y su actitud graciosa de revelar “profundidades y secretos/oscuridades” (2,22; LXX TH: αὐτὸς ἀποκαλύπτει βαθέα καὶ ἀπόκρυφα; LXX O: ἀνακαλύπτων τὰ βαθέα καὶ σκοτεινὰ). En este pasaje aparecen muchos de los mimbres con los cuales Pablo tejera después 1 Co 2,6-10 y Rm 11,25-36: μυστήριον, βάθος, σοφία, σόφος, γινώσκω, ἀποκαλύπτω, αἰών.

La relación entre βάθος y μυστήριον nos permite conocer en qué referente está pensando el apóstol cuando emplea la metáfora de las profundidades. En 1 Co 2,1, el contenido del misterio es explicitado (γάρ) en el siguiente versículo con otro acusativo que lo aclara:

	verbo	dativo	acusativo
1 Co 2,1b	καταγγέλλων	ὑμῖν	τὸ μυστήριον <sup>21</sup> τοῦ θεοῦ
1 Co 2,2	οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι	ἐν ὑμῖν εἰ μὴ	Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον

<sup>20</sup> Cf. R. PENNA, *Il «Mysterion» paolino*. Traiettorie e costituzione (SRivBib 10; Brescia 1978); M. N. A. BOCKMUEHL, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 36; Tübingen 1990); GLADD, *Revealing the Mysterion*. Nótese que también en Qumrán se relacionan los dos conceptos: 1QS 11,19 (“... y contemplar la profundidad de tus misterios [רִיכָה בְּעִימָה]”); βάθος traduce עֲמִקָּה en Ecl 7,24; Sal 68,3.15; Is 51,10; y μυστήριον traduce רִי en Dn 2,18.19.27.28.29.30.47. Texto hebreo en *Scrolls from Qumrán Cave I*. From photographs by John C. TREVER (Jerusalem 1972) 147.

<sup>21</sup> La tradición textual de 1 Co 2,1 varía entre τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (P<sup>46</sup>

Así pues, el misterio de Dios de 1 Co 2,1 y la sabiduría en el misterio de 2,7 remiten al anuncio del Mesías crucificado<sup>22</sup>. Consecuentemente, el referente de “las profundidades de Dios” no debería buscarse en algún arcano secreto gnóstico<sup>23</sup>, sino en el desconcertante designio de Dios, quien ha tenido a bien salvar por medio de la fe en la predicación de la cruz<sup>24</sup>. Del mismo modo,

---

ⲛ A C y pocos más) y τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ θεοῦ (ⲛ<sup>2</sup> B D F G y la mayoría). La <sup>27</sup>NA prefiere μυστήριον; la <sup>4</sup>GNT le da un valor de B, letra que indica que un texto es casi cierto. También a favor de esta lectura, V. KOPERSKI, “«Mystery of God» or «Testimony of God» in 1 Cor 2,1: Textual and Exegetical Considerations”, *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*. Festschrift J. Delobel (eds. J. DELOBEL – A. DENAUX) (BETHL 161; Leuven – Sterling, VA 2002) 305-315; y GLADD, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 123-126, que sintetiza los argumentos a favor: “In sum, the reading μυστήριον should be preferred because of the following points: 1) the external support for μυστήριον slightly outweighs μαρτύριον; 2) the number of textual variants (four total) suggests that scribes had difficulty understanding 2:1, so they substituted the easier reading μαρτύριον, thus harmonizing it with 1:6; 3) the immediate context reinforces μυστήριον because of Paul’s apocalyptic persona” (p. 126).

<sup>22</sup> Así BORNKAMM, *TDNT*, IV, 819; R. B. HAYS, *First Corinthians* (Louisville, KY 1997) 44; STRÜDER, *Gesinnung Christi*, 256-303; J. A. FITZMYER, *First Corinthians* (AncB 32; New Haven, CT – London 2008) 171. Para algunos (R. K. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* [UT 630; Tübingen 1984] 327-328; R. SCROGGS, “Paul: Sophos and Pneumatikos”, *NTS* 14 [1967] 33-55), esta sabiduría en el misterio reservada a los perfectos (2,6-16) está más allá de la predicación de la cruz (1,18-2,5); aludiría a verdades arcanas solo accesibles a los iniciados. Sin embargo, además de que sería extraño que Pablo cambiara el referente de la sabiduría de la que viene hablando hasta ahora, GLADD, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 119, nota que la dinámica de 1 Co 1-4 es precisamente la contraria: él no quiere reforzar la conciencia de élite, sino luchar contra las divisiones entre los creyentes. Cf. también la crítica a esta teoría de S. GRINDHEIM, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul’s Challenge to the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthians 2:6-16)”, *JBL* 121 (2002) 693-696.

<sup>23</sup> El gnosticismo cristiano empleará el léxico de βάθος en sus pesquisas sobre los misterios divinos. Además de la misteriosa formulación de Ap 2,24: “las profundidades de Satanás” (τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ), Hipólito comenta: “se llamaron a sí mismos gnósticos, alegando que ellos solos conocen las profundidades” (ἐπεκάλεσαν ἑαυτοὺς γνωστικούς, φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν: *Ref.* 5.6.4; HIPPOLYTUS, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* [ed. M. Marcovich] [TS 25; Berlin – New York, NY 1986]). Cf. más textos en la nota 35.

<sup>24</sup> W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 1 Kor 1,1-6,11 (EKKNT 7/1; Zürich 1991) I, 257-258: “Aber auch bei anderem Hintergrund bliebe deutlich, dass hier keine spekulative oder abstrakte Unermesslichkeit gemeint

cuando Pablo en Rm 11,33 invoca la rica profundidad de la sabiduría y ciencia divinas se está refiriendo al contenido del misterio revelado en 11,25 también de índole salvífica: que el endurecimiento parcial que sobrevino a Israel durará hasta que entre la totalidad de los gentiles.

Por tanto, los dos referentes de la metáfora son de índole histórico-salvífica. La profundidad que el hombre no puede alcanzar por sí mismo, pero que desea conocer, no consiste en verdades abstractas y esotéricas, sino en el despliegue de la salvación acaecida en el acontecimiento histórico del Mesías crucificado (1 Corintios 1–2) y que es promesa para el futuro de Israel (Rm 11). Los dos referentes no están lejanos. Aunque los dos misterios revelados en 1 Corintios 1–2 y Romanos 11 tengan perfiles diversos, y aunque se refieran a tiempos distintos (el pasado/presente del anuncio del Mesías crucificado; el presente/futuro de la conversión de los gentiles y la salvación de todo Israel), albergan en realidad la misma promesa salvífica, que también alcanza a judíos y griegos en 1 Co 1,24, y que requiere la fe en Jesucristo, muerto y resucitado, según Rm 10,7.9 (9,30–10,21) y 11,26.

Con todo, resulta conveniente matizar el razonamiento realizado. El silogismo (si “profundidad” y “misterio” aluden al mismo contenido y “misterio” se refiere a “la predicación de la cruz” y a “la salvación de todo Israel”, entonces el referente de “profundidad” es “la predicación de la cruz” y “la salvación de Israel”) tiene su parte de verdad pero también elimina algunos matices que no deberían ser obviados.

Por un lado, en 1 Co 2,6-16, Pablo ya no se ocupa del contenido de la sabiduría divina (1,18–2,5: el logos de la cruz), sino del acceso a dicha sabiduría, escondida en el misterio, solo viable por medio del Espíritu. Thiselton ha mostrado que el apóstol desarrolla así su argu-

---

ist und sich “die Tiefen Gottes” von dem schon geschenehen Gnadenhandeln (V 12) nicht trennen oder als das Tiefer oder Tiefste dem Kreuzeslogos gegenüberstellen lassen oder diesen überbieten”. M. M. MITCHELL, *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge – New York, NY 2010) 40, interpreta la metáfora de “las profundidades de Dios” no tanto como referida a un *contenido* (el anuncio del Mesías crucificado), cuanto referida a una *clave de interpretación*: “the metaphor of divine depths implies an «under-sense» to the realities of this world, one which in effect flips them over. You say foolish but you mean wise; you see weakness but you really see power”. Esta sugerencia implica que el Espíritu no sólo revela secretos ocultos, sino que también cambia la perspectiva del agraciado de modo que ahora entiende el sentido profundo de todo lo demás.

mentación porque los corintios se consideraban ya maduros, basados en las posibilidades de la gnosis propia y del espíritu natural <sup>25</sup>. Pablo, por tanto, pone el énfasis en la semejanza entre Dios y el hombre en materia de conocimiento: solo el Espíritu que proviene de Dios — nótese la explicitación de la preposición (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: 1 Co 2,12) — puede revelar “las cosas de Dios”. Y precisamente para persuadir de ello, la expresión τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ es muy apropiada ya que ayuda a subrayar la distancia que existe entre el objeto de conocimiento y las capacidades del que conoce. Además, la metáfora posee otra ventaja: sugiere que el creyente jamás puede abarcar y dominar el paradójico anuncio del Mesías crucificado, siempre más allá de él.

Por otro lado, Pablo acaba Romanos 9–11 con una composición himnica <sup>26</sup>. Tras desvelar que el provisorio rechazo de Israel ha servido para el bien de los gentiles, y enunciar la paradoja de Rm 11,32 (“Dios ha encerrado a todos los hombres en la desobediencia para tener misericordia de todos”), el apóstol remata la sección cambiando el tono: pasa del nivel discursivo (*logos*) al himnico (*pathos*). Para ello emplea una serie de recursos retóricos (la exclamación con ὦ, la acumulación de términos, las citas, la doxología, etc.) a los que se suma la metáfora de la profundidad, que orienta la perspectiva del oyente desde la exposición precisa a la evocación humilde y enco-miástica. Tras el amplio esfuerzo argumentativo de Rm 9–11, al final a Pablo le parece más honesto elogiar la grandeza de la sabiduría divina y admitir su propia limitación. Él cesa de comprender y prefiere reconocer. En conclusión, no solo se debe esclarecer el referente de la profundidad en cada texto, sino también se debe considerar el que Pablo aduce la metáfora porque aporta significados complementarios que enriquecen cada argumentación.

#### IV. Revisitando las profundidades

Reparemos por un instante en la diacronía de la metáfora, ¿cuál es su devenir histórico? Pablo la emplea por primera vez en 1 Corintios. Muchos estudiosos han mostrado que él retoma en 1 Co 2,6-16

<sup>25</sup> Cf. A.C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle 2000) 252, 258-259.

<sup>26</sup> Así R. JEWETT, *Romans. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2007) 713-715, con bibliografía.

conceptos usados por los Corintios para cambiar desde ellos sus criterios<sup>27</sup>. La *inventio* de τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Co 2,10), sintagma único en sus cartas, puede ser interpretada también de esta manera: Pablo aduce una formulación corintia para convencerlos a partir de sus propias palabras<sup>28</sup>. Aunque es muy difícil conocer en qué sentido la podrían haber usado los corintios, sí parece probable afirmar que Pablo renegocia el sentido de la metáfora para subrayar los límites de la sabiduría humana. Si ellos se sentían orgullosos de la gnosis que podían alcanzar —incluso, quizás, creyéndose conocedores de las profundidades divinas—, él les recuerda que sólo el Espíritu permite acceder a ellas.

Tras haber usado el término en 2 Co 8,2 para magnificar la pobreza de los macedonios, Pablo vuelve a echar mano de él cuando dicta Romanos. En Rm 8,39, invoca la “profundidad” como ámbito sobrehumano que, sin embargo, no debe ser temido, pues no puede separar al creyente del amor de Dios. En Rm 11,33, βάθος reaparece con perfiles más positivos: el término es aducido en el himno a la insondable sabiduría divina. A la luz de este recorrido podemos aventurar dos hipótesis acerca del devenir diacrónico de la metáfora.

En cuanto a Pablo, resulta plausible proponer que él ha tomado prestada una expresión ajena y la ha reinterpretado desde sus coordenadas teológicas al servicio de los intereses propios de cada carta<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> B. A. PEARSON, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians*. A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism (SBL.DS 12; Missoula, MT 1973) 31: “What is decisive in this passage is that Paul is dependent upon the opponents’ terminology, but uses this terminology to express his own radically different theological point of view”. Cf. también G. D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 102-103; SCHRAGE, *1. Korinther*, I, 255-256; HAYS, *1 Corinthians*, 41-42; R. F. COLLINS, *First Corinthians* (SrP 7; Collegeville, MN 1999) 124; THISELTON, *1 Corinthians*, 225; Cf. la crítica de E. J. SCHNABEL, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (HTA; Wuppertal 2006) 161.

<sup>28</sup> Así J. REILING, “Wisdom and the Spirit: An Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 2,6-16”, *Text and Testimony* (eds. J. BAARDA et al.) (Kampen 1988) 206; y COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, 133.

<sup>29</sup> MITCHELL, *Paul, the Corinthians*, 8-10.106, nota que Pablo y los corintios van renegociando a lo largo de la correspondencia corintia el sentido de los conceptos que van empleando. Otro ejemplo de este fenómeno es el uso de ἀσθενής. V. GÄCKLE, *Die Starken und die Schwachen in Korinth und in Rom*. Zu Herkunft und Funktion der Antithese in 1 Kor 8,1-11,1 und in Röm



Podríamos decir que el apóstol ha ido retornando a las inhóspitas “profundidades divinas” a medida que las necesidades persuasivas de sus comunidades se lo exigían.

En cuanto a los corintios, apunto un posible escenario de lectura de Romanos 11 a partir de 1 Corintios 2. Dunn dice que no hay ningún argumento de peso para identificar en Rm 11,33-36 una previa forma himnica del judaísmo helenístico o del primer judeo-cristianismo <sup>30</sup>. Él señala que Pablo, más bien, retoma una matriz de conceptos que ya había empleado en 1 Corintios. A partir de ello, Dunn propone:

Since Romans was probably written from Corinth such parallels strongly suggest some influence from Paul’s involvement at Corinth in his framing of this hymn of adoration <sup>31</sup>.

Teniendo en cuenta que los corintios muy probablemente leyeron la nueva carta antes de ser enviada a los romanos, y puesto que Pablo tendría conciencia de ello <sup>32</sup>, resulta interesante analizar la metáfora de Rm 11,33 no solo como destinada a la audiencia romana sino también como relectura <sup>33</sup> para la audiencia corintia de lo ya dicho en 1 Co 2,10. Los corintios, segunda audiencia de *Romanos*, debían aprender en esta nueva carta que la profundidad de la sabiduría divina no solo podía ser investigada en el plano cognoscitivo — labor imposible para el espíritu humano, pero plausible gracias al Espíritu —, sino que también debía ser ensalzada en el registro celebrativo.

---

14,1-15,13 (WUNT II.200; Tübingen 2004) 46-48, ha probado que “débil” era un apelativo despectivo con el que algunos corintios — los “fuertes”, por contraste — se referían a aquellos que se sentían manchados al comer los idolitos (1 Co 8,7-13). Pablo retomará este concepto negativo y lo convertirá, ya en 1 Corintios 1-4 pero sobre todo en 2 Corintios 10-13, en una actitud indispensable para dejar espacio a la actuación de la fuerza divina.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. DUNN, *Romans*, II, 698. En contra, JEWETT, *Romans*, 713-715.

<sup>31</sup> DUNN, *Romans*, II, 698.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. A. PEREIRA DELGADO, “Segundas audiencias de las cartas paulinas”, *Non mi vergogno del Vangelo, potenza di Dio*. Studi in onore di Jean-Noël Aletti S.J. nel suo 70° compleanno (ed. F. BIANCHINI – S. ROMANELLO) (AnBib 200; Roma 2012) 99-116.

<sup>33</sup> La relectura es una relación comunicativa entre dos textos que se interpretan mutuamente. El primero posibilita la creación del segundo, a la vez que el segundo perfila y completa la comprensión del primero. Cf. A. DETTWILER, “Le phénomène de la relecture dans la tradition johannique: une proposition de typologie”, *Intertextualités*. La Bible en écho (ed. D. MARGUERAT – A. CURTIS) (MoBi 40; Genève 2000) 185-200.

## V. El rostro profundo de Dios

1 Co 2,10 y Rm 11,33 poseen una última semejanza en la formulación de la metáfora. En los dos textos el nominativo  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$  es especificado por el genitivo  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  <sup>34</sup>. Hay varias opciones exegéticas: Dios — en su sabiduría — puede poseer profundidades ignotas (genitivo posesivo); puede originar profundidades recónditas (genitivo de origen); o incluso Dios puede ser, por así decirlo, la profundidad abismal (genitivo epexeagético), el totalmente Otro. De hecho, en ambientes gnósticos, Dios recibirá más tarde el nombre de  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$  <sup>35</sup>. Con todo, estimo más apropiado interpretar los dos textos paulinos como genitivos posesivos o de origen. Ahora bien, el uso metafórico de la profundidad atribuida a Dios en 1 Co 2,10 y Rm 11,33 puede ayudarnos a conocer y matizar el rostro divino que el apóstol tiene en mente. Tomando prestado de Pablo la imagen del velo (2 Co 3,13-18), nos preguntamos: ¿qué “velan” y qué “revelan” las “profundidades divinas”?

a) Dios velado: indispensable reconocimiento de la alteridad divina. El apóstol usa la metáfora para advertir — a los corintios — y reconocer — ante los romanos — la alteridad divina. Dios y sus designios están abismalmente distantes del hombre, que debe reconocer y ensalzar su sabiduría, pero nunca pretender abarcarla o dominarla <sup>36</sup>. Ahora

<sup>34</sup> Ya hemos explicado que Rm 11,33 funciona como una macro-endíadis, por lo que el genitivo final atribuye también al nominativo inicial.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. SCHLIER, “ $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ”, *TDNT*, I, 517. En *Act. Thom.* 143, se dice de Jesucristo que Él es “hijo unigénito de la Profundidad” ( $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ ; en M. BONNET [ed.], *Acta Philippi, Acta Thomae, Acta Barnabae* [AAAp II.2; Lipsiae 1903] 250). Y Valentín llama a Dios “raíz, profundidad, abismo ( $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \beta\upsilon\theta\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$ )” (en HIPPOLYTUS, *Ref.* 6.30.7). En este texto, se usa una expresión cercana a 1 Co 2,10: el eón más joven, Sophia, viendo la grandeza de los otros, vuelve a “la profundidad del Padre” ( $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ ; 6.30.6) y allí capta una verdad esencial. En el Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae se conserva un texto copto gnóstico que dice: “Tú eres el solo ser sin fin [ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ]; y tú eres la sola profundidad [ $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ]; y tú eres el solo incognoscible...” (la reconstrucción griega procede del editor C. SCHMIDT, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache aus dem Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae* [TU 8,1-2; Leipzig 1892] 304).

<sup>36</sup> Sobre 1 Corintios 1-2, J.-N. ALETTI, “Sagesse et mystère chez Paul. Réflexions sur le rapprochement de deux champs lexicographiques”, *La sagesse biblique de l’Ancien au Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. TROUBLET) (LeDiv 160; Paris 1995) 367: “La geste de Paul a pour conséquence de mettre l’Évangile, en ses paradoxes fondamentaux, à distance de la reprise conceptuelle, toujours tentée de dominer ou digérer la cohérence qu’elle perçoit”.

bien, la fuerza semántica de la metáfora no se reduce solo a su valor ético, como exhortación correctiva ante las pretensiones de gloria y conocimiento de los corintios; ni a su valor estético, que colabora en la gestación de un final retóricamente bello, tras el amplio y fatigoso esfuerzo por comprender los designios de Dios respecto de Israel en Romanos 9–11. Ella alberga también un evocador valor teológico: abre al oyente a la experiencia del *Deus semper maior*, y lo invita a reconocer humildemente su inmensidad.

Nótese que la metáfora produce esta experiencia de conocimiento precisamente velando su referente. Su carácter oculto y trascendente le hace reconocer, por un lado, la pequeñez humana y, por otro, la certeza de la grandeza divina. Puesto que Dios es Señor de las profundidades, el creyente se reconoce limitado, pero también tiene la certeza de que hay un más allá de sabiduría y adivina que desde Dios podrá acceder a él. Así pues, la metáfora invita al fiel a confiar en Dios y sus medios, aunque sean desconcertantes, paradójicos e inauditos: el anuncio de un Mesías crucificado, y el designio divino de encerrar a todos en la desobediencia para tener misericordia de todos. Ahora bien, la dinámica de la metáfora obliga a reconocer que incluso la revelación del misterio es solo un esbozo: la metáfora fuerza a aceptar que Dios está siempre más allá o, por ser fiel a ella, siempre más profundo <sup>37</sup>.

b) Dios revelado: el gozo de la profundidad desvelada. Pero, a pesar de la cautela propia de aquellos que deben aceptar que todavía conocen “en parte” porque no ha llegado “lo perfecto” (1 Co 13,9) y que en esta edad ven “a través de un espejo, en enigma” (1 Co 13,12), bien es cierto que tanto en 1 Corintios 1–2 como en Romanos 9–11 se desvelan aspectos del misterio. Aunque las profundidades siguen más allá del hombre, Dios las ha acercado a los creyentes que pueden ya visitar sus regiones ignotas y atisbar sus planes, designios que son de salvación venturosa. Por ello, el tono final de Rm 11,33-36 es esencialmente gozoso. Pablo no se queja de la limitación humana, ni reconoce con resignación la incognoscibilidad divina — como en ciertos pasajes de Job o 2 Baruc —,

---

<sup>37</sup> Sobre Rm 11,33-36, DUNN, *Romans*, II, 703: “the feeling is of one who has been permitted to perceive something of God’s ways with humankind, but whose overwhelming impression is that the something is only a passing glance into mysteries too deep to begin to penetrate, too vast even to begin to comprehend”.

sino que exclama con entusiasmo ante lo que Dios ya le ha revelado. Y es que los redimidos no pueden por más que rendir “gloria” (Rm 11,36) a Aquel que previamente los justificó, “glorificó” (Rm 8,30) y predestinó su sabiduría en el misterio para la “gloria” (1 Co 2,7) de los que aman a Dios (1 Co 2,10).

c/Pedro Salinas  
24 1ºA; 41013 Sevilla, España

Álvaro PEREIRA-DELGADO

#### SUMMARY

Paul employs both in 1 Cor 11,33 and in Rm 2,10 the metaphor of “depth” (*bathos*) associated with the theme of knowledge. In the two units (1 Corinthians 1–4; Romans 9–11), this metaphor is related to other terms: “mystery”, “wisdom”, “mind of the Lord” (Is 40,13 in 1 Cor 2,16 and Rm 11,34). After outlining the semantic nuances of the metaphor, we study its *inventio* (why does Paul use it?), and then reflect on how the two passages combine the limitation of human knowledge, the greatness of divine revelation, and the promise of eschatological salvation.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Genesis 22: What Question Should We Ask the Text <sup>1</sup>?

### I. Introduction: the basic question

Almost everyone knows the famous sentence by Immanuel Kant about Genesis 22: “That I should not kill my son is absolutely sure. But that you, who appear to me, are God in person, of that I am not sure at all even when your voice thunders from heaven” <sup>2</sup>. This question had been asked already in Antiquity by such Church writers as Origen and Augustine. The *Genesis Rabbah* explains that Sarah dies in Genesis 23 because she learned from Abraham, when coming back, that her son could have been offered in sacrifice (*GenRabbah* 58,5). All this is to say that, for ancient as for more recent writers, Abraham’s trial raises many questions about the figure of God that appears in the story <sup>3</sup>. Earlier, for the *Book of Jubilees* (160-150 BCE circa), the divine being who puts Abraham to the test is not God in person, but the demon Mastema (17,16). In recent times, B. Jacob proposed a similar exegesis. For him, *hā’ēlōhīm* in Gen 22,1 is but a divine being, a member of the divine court, as Satan or the “sons of God” in Job 1,6, the “spirit” in 1 Kgs 22,19-23, or the angel of YHWH in Num 22,22 <sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised text of a conference given at the SBL Congress in Chicago, IL, on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November, 2012. I thank the organizer, Prof. Klaus-Peter Adam, and the participants, Profs. Joel Baden, Hans-Christoph Schmitt, Jörg Jeremias, and Konrad Schmid, for their useful remarks and observations.

<sup>2</sup> Immanuel KANT, “Der Streit der Fakultäten” (1798), *Werke in sechs Bänden* (Hrsg. W. WEISCHEDL) (Darmstadt 1956, <sup>4</sup>1998) VI, 333.

<sup>3</sup> For the early and recent exegesis of Genesis 22, see D. LERCH, *Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (BHT 12; Tübingen 1950); J.A. FITZMYER, “The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature”, *Bib* 83 (2002) 211-212; R.M. JENSEN, “The Offering of Isaac in Jewish and Christian Tradition”, *BibInt* 2 (1994) 85-110; F. MANNS (ed.), *The Sacrifice of Isaac in the three Monotheistic Religions* (SBFAn 41; Jerusalem 1995); J.A. STEIGER – U. HEINEN, *Isaaks Opferung (Gen 22) in den Konfessionen und Medien der frühen Neuzeit* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 101; Berlin – New York 2006).

<sup>4</sup> B. JACOB, *Das erste Buch der Tora. Genesis* (Berlin 1934) 491-492.

## II. God or YHWH?

Let me start with a first question that has a bearing on the exegesis of the text. For a long time, Genesis 22 was considered as a typical Elohist text. The main reasons are three: (1) the use of Elohim in 22,2.3.8.9.12; (2) the theme of the “fear of God” in 22,12, and (3) the avoidance of anthropomorphic representations of God. The problem was of course the appearance of the name YHWH in 22,11 and 14. Some have attempted to brush aside the difficulty and attribute these two exceptions to redactional interventions. But then, why do we find these two names only in these two verses? The redactor could have been more consistent and spoken of “fear of YHWH” in 22,12 or, say, in 22,14, “God is seen” since the verse is a clear allusion to 22,8 “God will provide” where the appellative Elohim is used.

The question is thus the following: why do we find YHWH only in 22,12 and 14? First, one has to admit that there is complete identity between the “God” that puts Abraham to the test in 22,1-2 and the “angel of YHWH” that puts an end to this same test in 22,11-12. The angel of YHWH, in 22,12, says this: “He said, ‘Do not lay your hand on the boy or do anything to him; for now I know that you fear God, since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me’” (NRSV). The end of the sentence “since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me”, and not “from God”, clearly implies that the angel of YHWH that intervenes at this moment in the scene is the same as the “God” who required the sacrifice in 22,2. As for the use of “Elohim” instead of YHWH in the expression “fear of God” at the beginning of the sentence, it can be explained as a literary convention. Twice in the Book of Job, YHWH himself uses the expression when he speaks of Job to Satan: “There is no one like [Job] on the earth, a blameless and upright man who fears God and turns away from evil” (Job 1,8; cf. 2,3).

The use of YHWH in 22,12.14 can be explained in several ways<sup>5</sup>. In my opinion, the rabbis of old proposed an interesting solution. “God” is the universal and anonymous divinity, whereas YHWH is the personal and national God of Israel. It was therefore fitting to make the “angel of YHWH”, and not the “angel of God”, intervene at the crucial moment in the narrative. In the same way, the name YHWH was more appropriate than Elohim in the etiology in v. 14 since it is linked with a cultic place, and most probably to Jerusalem, albeit in a veiled way.

---

<sup>5</sup> For a summary, see E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 320-331, 323. For him, the name YHWH appears as soon as the divinity shows a more positive disposition towards Abraham.

After these reflections, I think that we may have reached a first conclusion, namely that there is only one “divine character” in the whole narrative even though this character may bear different names or appellations. The next problem is how to define more precisely the role of the divine personage.

### III. A plot of discovery <sup>6</sup>

The narrative begins with the well-known sentence: “After these things God put Abraham to the test”. What is the purpose of a test? Looking for parallels, one finds at least three texts that answer this question, two of them coming from the Book of Deuteronomy (Deut 8,2; 13,3), and one being a typical Deuteronomistic text (Judg 3,4). The last example is surely a late text (2 Chr 32,31). Here are the texts:

Deut 8,2:

Remember the long way that YHWH your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, in order to humble you, testing you to know what was in your heart, whether or not you would keep his commandments.

Deut 13,3:

You must not heed the words of those prophets or those who divine by dreams; for YHWH your God is testing you, to know whether you indeed love YHWH your God with all your heart and soul.

Judg 3,4:

They were for the testing of Israel, to know whether Israel would obey the commandments of YHWH, which he commanded their ancestors by Moses.

2 Chr 32,31:

And so in the matter of the envoys of the princes of Babylon, who had been sent to him [Hezekiah] to inquire about the sign that had been done in the land, God left him to himself, in order to test him and to know all that was in his heart.

---

<sup>6</sup> For this terminology of Aristotelian origin, see J.L. SKA, “*Our Fathers Have Told Us*”. Introduction into the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (SubBib 13; Rome <sup>2</sup>2000) 18-19.



These texts are unequivocal in attesting that the purpose of a test is “to know”. This fact has two consequences. First, we have one reason more to believe that there is only one divine actor in Genesis 22 where the pair “to test” and “to know” appear again together as the two key elements of the plot. The “character” that puts to the “test” (Gen 22,1 - נִסָּה) must be the one that “knows” (יָדַע) in the end. It would be difficult to attribute these two narrative functions to two different characters. Second, the basic plot of Genesis 22 is a plot of discovery. In other words it describes the passage from ignorance to knowledge, according to the long-established categories of Aristotle. We have in Gen 22,11-12 the *anagnorisis*, to use another term borrowed from Aristotle’s *Poetics*, i.e. the moment of recognition <sup>7</sup>. This raises a further question, definitely, since the one that passes from ignorance to knowledge is, in this case, none but the otherwise omniscient divinity.

The vexing question has received all kinds of answers, from Antiquity up to recent times <sup>8</sup>. From the Renaissance on, exegetes explain it as anthropomorphism, a point that would contradict — to a certain extent — the attribution of this text to the Elohist. Anyway, the God that is depicted in this narrative does not know at the beginning of the story how Abraham will answer the test. Otherwise there is no test and it would be difficult to understand why the angel of YHWH says in 22,12, “Now I know” <sup>9</sup>.

#### IV. God’s freedom and Abraham’s free will

Let us come back just for a while to the basic question: why does God put Abraham to the test? We simply took it to mean that it is to “know” whether Abraham will obey his voice or not. But is this test useful, or even necessary? Was it not possible for God to know Abraham’s disposition in a different, less cruel, way?

A first possible answer is that God’s power and authority are unlimited in the Old Testament. The God of Genesis 22 behaves like any Ancient Near Eastern potentate. Nobody dares to challenge a monarch and, *a fortiori*, nobody dares to challenge the biblical God’s authority. Everyone remembers Job’s sentence: “YHWH gave, and YHWH has taken away; blessed be the name of YHWH” (Job 1,21). This interpretation is possible, of course,

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle, *Poetics*, 11, 1452a30–32.

<sup>8</sup> See J.L. SKA, “Et maintenant, je sais (Genèse 22,12)”, *Palabra, Prodigio, Poesía*. In Memoriam Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J. (ed. V. COLLADO BERTOMEU) (Roma – Jávea [Alicante] 2003) 117-144 = “‘And Now I Know’ (Gen 22:12)”, Id., *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch* (FAT 66; Tübingen 2009) 111-138.

<sup>9</sup> See BLUM, *Vätergeschichte*, 322.

but begs the question since we may ask why the divinity uses this kind of authority in these particular circumstances and not elsewhere in the Abraham cycle.

Other possible answers have been proposed <sup>10</sup>. Hermann Gunkel was the first to see in the background of the story an old narrative that justified the abolition of child sacrifices <sup>11</sup>. Three main objections were raised against a typical “history of religion” way of thinking. First, Isaac himself says in 22,7 that the normal victim of a sacrifice is a lamb or a kid (Hebrew אֵז). Second, child sacrifices are a very rare custom, and specialists contest today that this usage was frequent among Semites, even among Phoenicians and Carthaginians <sup>12</sup>. Children’s tombs contain most of the time bodies of infants that died very early, not of sacrificed young human beings. Third, this interpretation may apply to the early stage of the narrative, not to the narrative as it stands now.

Gerhard von Rad chose a different way and proposed to integrate the text into the wider complex of the history of salvation <sup>13</sup>. In a few words, the narrative confirms that the promise will be fulfilled in spite of all dangers and difficulties. Again, this view does not bear closer scrutiny. First, Gerhard von Rad interprets Genesis 22 in the framework of an Elohist source where the promises are spelled out by God in Genesis 15. As is generally known, the attribution of Genesis 15 to the Elohist is, to say the least, problematic since the text uses the divine name YHWH throughout. Second, there are no clear links between Genesis 15 and Genesis 22. Third, the existence of a complete and independent Elohist source is

---

<sup>10</sup> In this part, I depend mostly on K. SCHMID, “Die Rückgabe der Verheißungsgabe. Der »heilgeschichtliche« Sinn von Gen 22 im Horizont innerbiblischen Exegese”, *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*. Festschrift Otto Kaiser zum 80. Geburtstag (Hrsg. M. WITTE) (BZAW 345/1; Berlin – New York 2004) 271-300, with a few additions and some slight variations.

<sup>11</sup> H. GUNKEL, *Genesis* (HK I/1; Göttingen <sup>3</sup>1910) 240–242.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, P. MAIBERGER, “Genesis 22 und die Problematik des Menschenopfers in Israel”, *BK* 41 (1986) 104-112; S. MOSCATI, *Gli adoratori di Moloch* (Milano 1991); ID., *Il santuario dei bambini (tofet)* (Itinerari – XI; Roma 1992); J.D. LEVENSON, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son*. The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity (New Haven, CT 1993); ID., *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel*. The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life (New Haven, CT 2006); K. FINSTERBUSCH – A. LANGE – K.F.D. ROMHELD (eds.), *Human Sacrifice in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Studies in the History of Religions. Numen Book Series 112; Leiden – Boston, MA 2007).

<sup>13</sup> G. VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose Genesis* (ATD 2–4; Göttingen 1952) 203-209; see also ID., *Das Opfer des Abraham*. Mit Texten von Luther, Kierkegaard, Kolakowski und Bildern von Rembrandt (Kaiser Traktate 6; München 1971).

contested by many scholars today. Fourth, the clearest connection with the other promises is to be found in 22,15-18, a text which is considered by a majority of commentators as a later addition. All in all, we must say that most of the arguments do not hold water or would require a further, more thorough, discussion.

Timo Veijola tries to avoid all the aforementioned pitfalls and looks in a different direction. For him, Abraham is a “paradigm of faith in the post-exilic period”<sup>14</sup>. As we will see, the late dating proved to be a fruitful insight. On the other hand, one may ask whether the text speaks of faith, of obedience, or of “fear of God”. Faith as such is not mentioned in the text, and can be read only in the background. Eventually, the text speaks of a “test”, and this element is present in what can be called a “title” or a “proleptic summary” of the whole narrative.

Another way of interpreting the text is suggested by Georg Steins and several others, namely a canonical and intertextual reading of Genesis 22<sup>15</sup>. They pinpoint a whole range of quotations and echoes of, and allusions to, other texts in the narrative of Abraham’s test<sup>16</sup>. There are, according to G. Steins, many allusions to the Sinai pericope, and Genesis 22 would be a kind of prologue or foreshadowing of God’s theophany and covenant with Israel. The main problem of this method, as was underlined by Brevard S. Childs himself, is the difference between the “intention of the text” and the “intention of the reader”, especially the modern reader. It is clear that the allusions to the Sinai pericope do not appear at the surface of Genesis 22 and are not part of what can be called its plain meaning.

Other studies must be mentioned of a more literary and sometimes synchronic type<sup>17</sup>. A point common to several of these studies is to approach

---

<sup>14</sup> T. VEIJOLA, “Das Opfer des Abraham – Paradigma des Glaubens aus dem nachexilischen Zeitalter”, *ZTK* 85 (1988) 129-164.

<sup>15</sup> G. STEINS, *Die »Bindung Isaaks« im Kanon (Gen 22)*. Grundlagen und Programm einer kanonisch-intertextuellen Lektüre. Mit einer Spezialbibliographie zu Gen 22 (HBS 20; Freiburg im Breisgau 1999); ID., “Abrahams Opfer – Annäherung an einen abgründigen Text”, *ZKT* 121 (1999) 311-324 = *Kanonisch-intertextuelle Studien zum Alten Testament* (SBAB 48; Stuttgart 2009) 169-182.

<sup>16</sup> B.S. CHILDS, “Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation”, *ZAW* 115 (2003) 173-184.

<sup>17</sup> See, for instance, R. LACK, “Le sacrifice d’Isaac. Analyse structurale de la couche élohiste dans Gen 22”, *Bib* 56 (1975) 1-12; S.E. MCEVENUE, “The Elohist at Work”, *ZAW* 96 (1984) 315-332; Y. MAZOR, “Genesis 22: The Ideological Rhetoric and the Psychological Composition”, *Bib* 67 (1986) 81-88; J.L. SKA, “Gn 22,1-19. Essai sur les niveaux de lecture”, *Bib* 69 (1988) 324-339 = “Genesis 22 and the Testing of Abraham: An Essay on the Levels of Reading”, ID., *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch* (FAT 66; Tübingen 2009) 97-110; F. LANDY,

the text from a fresh perspective, namely that of the reader. This means that the focus of attention is shifted from the text to its audience. "Every text counts with its audience" or, to put it in other words, there is no reading without the active participation of the audience. What is then the "meaning" of Genesis 22 according to this different perception of the narrative?

Let me start with a few simple observations of a literary nature. First, the text begins with a kind of title or summary: "After these things God put Abraham to the test" (22,1). This information, however, is conveyed to the audience, and not to Abraham. Only the reader knows that the following story is about a test. What the reader does not know is how Abraham will pass the test. In the terminology of Meir Sternberg, we have a "reader-elevating" situation in Genesis 22. But this situation is present in the narrative itself as well. Abraham knows God's order to sacrifice his son in holocaust. Isaac, on his part, and the servants, do not know about the real purpose of the journey. In short, the reader knows more than Abraham, and the latter knows more than Isaac (and the servants).

Besides these instances where the reader benefits from a superior knowledge, there are other cases where we have to admit that Abraham knows more than the reader or, to use Meir Sternberg's terminology again, we have to deal with "character-elevating" situations. The most striking feature in Genesis 22 is, actually, that the reader never knows what are Abraham's thoughts and feelings. This is what Erich Auerbach aptly described with the German word "Hintergründlichkeit," a word translated with the phrase "fraught with background"<sup>18</sup>. The background of Genesis 22 is a fathomless area swarming with repressed feelings. Abraham's interior tragedy is not described. The reader only sees some gestures, for instance the preparation of the journey, the way up to the top of the moun-

---

"Narrative Techniques and Symbolic Transactions in the Akedah", *Signs and Wonders*. Biblical Texts in Literary Focus (ed. J.C. EXUM) (Atlanta, GA 1989) 1-40; J.P. FOKKELMAN, "'On the Mount of the Lord There Is Vision': A Response to Francis Landy concerning the Akedah", *Signs and Wonders*. Biblical Texts in Literary Focus (ed. J.C. EXUM) (Atlanta, GA 1989) 41-59; A. WÉNIN, "Abraham à la rencontre de YHWH. Une lecture de Gn 22", *RTL* 20 (1989) 162-177; ID., *Isaac ou l'épreuve d'Abraham*. Approche narrative de Genèse 22 (Le livre et le rouleau 8; Paris – Bruxelles 1999); A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, "The Reader in Genesis 22:1-19. Textsyntax – Textsemantics – Textpragmatics", *EstBib* 53 (1995) 289-304; C. LOMBAARD, "Problems of Narratological Analyses of Genesis 22:1-19", *Thinking Towards New Horizons*. Collected Communications to the XIX Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Liubljana 2007 (eds. M. AUGUSTIN – H.M. NIEMANN) (Frankfurt am Main 2008) 49-62.

<sup>18</sup> E. AUERBACH, *Mimesis*. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur (Bern 1946) 7-30.

tain, a few items such as the wood, the fire, and the knife, or the preparation of the altar and as far as the hand of Abraham lifted up above Isaac's throat. But there is never any clear hint at Abraham's mental or emotional processes. All that remains in the background of the narrative.

So much so that there is no explicit *peripeteia* (change of situation) in the present narrative <sup>19</sup>. There is no hint at Abraham's feelings, at his distress or anguish, before the moment of the sacrifice. But there is no hint at his relief and jubilation after this moment either. The narrative does not even say that Abraham untied his son after the angel of God's intervention. No gesture, no word, no tears of joy, no kissing, not even a glance towards his beloved son. Abraham only sees the ram caught in the bush (22,13) and offers it in sacrifice instead of his son whom we — readers — must imagine now beside the altar, and alive, albeit as silent and impassible as his father. The narrative does not describe any change of atmosphere, feeling, or situation after the angel of YHWH stops Abraham's hand lifted up to sacrifice his only and beloved son. There is only a change of knowledge, an *anagnorisis*, and this happens only in the divine character's "mind".

What does this mean? In my opinion, this means that the narrative tries first of all to involve the reader in Abraham's drama. Nobody knows his inner feeling — not even the God that appears in the narrative. In other words, the reader's task or role is to participate as much as possible in Abraham's (and Isaac's) tragic plight. The meaning of Genesis 22 is not exactly an idea, a message, a moral lesson, or even a truth. The real meaning is the active participation of the reader in the appalling quandary of a father asked to offer his son in holocaust to the very divinity that first promised and afterwards granted him this son. The meaning of the text depends to a large extent on the quality of the reader's participation in the patriarch's predicament.

This bids us to take one step further. There must be a reason why the reader is invited to share Abraham's disarray in the face of God's unforeseen and bewildering order. To look for a satisfactory answer we have to remember that Abraham is the ancestor of Israel and that, according to a famous aphorism by Ramban (Nachmanides, 1194-1270 CE), "what happens to the fathers happens to the sons" <sup>20</sup>. In simpler words, the narrative tries to project an experience of the reader into Abraham's life and to describe Abraham's reaction as a paradigmatic answer to this situation. What is this experience?

---

<sup>19</sup> For the definition in Aristotle's *Poetics*, see X, 1452a14-18 and, especially, XI, 1452a12-14.

<sup>20</sup> Nachmanides (Ramban – rabbi Moshe ben Nachman) 1194–1270 CE, on Genesis 12,10-20; quoted by M.Z. BRETTLER, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London 1995) 52-53.

Let us try to pinpoint some of its main features. First, God's order and behavior are in contradiction with everything that comes prior to it in the Abraham cycle. God promised a land and a son (or numerous descendants) to Abraham. The same God refused all the other possible solutions: Lot is put aside in Genesis 13, Eliezer, Abraham's servant, in Genesis 15, Ishmael in Genesis 16 and 21. The Priestly text in Gen 17,17-21 also confirms that the only possible heir to the promise is Isaac, and nobody else. After all these texts, of different origin and belonging to different literary layers, God seems to jeopardize or even to annihilate for ever Abraham's and Israel's future. This is a test, of course, as the reader knows. But the test itself touches one of the cornerstones of the Abraham cycle and clashes with all that has been said before about the promises.

Moreover, we can say that the image of God that appears in Genesis 22 clashes with the usual theology of the patriarchal narratives<sup>21</sup>. According to several specialists and some basic works in the field, the God of the patriarchs is — generally speaking — on the patriarchs' side, he hardly judges or punishes them, and does not require any special moral behavior. His blessing and his support are not conditioned by obedience to a law or specific regulations. This is well summarized by Psalm 105,12-15:

- <sup>12</sup> When they were few in number, of little account, and strangers in it,
- <sup>13</sup> wandering from nation to nation, from one kingdom to another people,
- <sup>14</sup> he allowed no one to oppress them; he rebuked kings on their account,
- <sup>15</sup> saying, "Do not touch my anointed ones; do my prophets no harm".

In this regard, Genesis 22 is different. God, in this text, is more similar to the divinity that appears, as we saw, in Deuteronomy or in the Deuteronomistic history. It is as if God put Israel's ancestor to the test before he put Israel to the test. The narrative also shows how to go through the test in the right way and to give an example to future generations. As we have seen, the test is a Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic topic. Even-

---

<sup>21</sup> See, for instance, R. ALBERTZ, *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion. Religionsinterner Pluralismus in Israel und Babylon* (Stuttgart 1978); T.N.D. METTINGER, *In Search of God. The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names* (Philadelphia, PA 1988) 63; K. VAN DER TOORN, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel. Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 7; Leiden 1996); J. BODEL – S.M. OLYAN (eds.), *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (Oxford 2008).

tually, Genesis 22 shows that, at the beginning of Israel's history, its ancestor succeeded where the people, afterwards, very often failed.

The main point, however, is that God requires an answer and does not simply stand on Abraham's side to support him in his trials. On the contrary, God is the cause of the trial. We are close to the Book of Job where God is often perceived as an enemy rather than an unconditioned ally <sup>22</sup>.

To use the vocabulary of semiotic analysis, God who was until now the "sender" (French: *destinateur*) of the narrative cycle, all of a sudden becomes an "opponent", at least in Abraham's experience. This is unusual, even impossible, according to the basic rules of semiotic analysis. God can be a helper, not an opponent. Or to say it in simpler words, in the Abraham cycle, God solves Abraham's problems and does not cause problems as he does in Genesis 22.

This is a complete surprise, of course, and does not correspond to anything else in Genesis 12-25. Some compare Genesis 22 with Genesis 21, where Abraham has to part with Ishmael. In this case, however, the initiative is Sarah's, not God's, and the divinity merely asks Abraham to comply with Sarah's wish <sup>23</sup>. Moreover, every unprejudiced reader is convinced that the narrative cycle had reached its conclusion in Genesis 21, with the birth of Isaac and, if necessary, the definitive expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael. Nothing prepares the audience for this dramatic turn of events in Genesis 22.

#### V. Genesis 22, "a white crow" <sup>24</sup>?

This means, of course, that Genesis 22,1-19 can hardly be considered as a "continuation" of anything else in the previous chapters <sup>25</sup>. There are connections, as many authors noted, especially with Gen 12,1-4 and Genesis 21, and somehow with Gen 13,14-18. This means — according to some good rules of exegesis — that Genesis 22 is logically posterior to these texts. Other allusions, especially to 2 Chr 3,1 (Mount Moriah), can

---

<sup>22</sup> See, for instance, Job 16,22, a sentence that could be said by Abraham: "I was at ease, and he broke me in two; he seized me by the neck and dashed me to pieces; he set me up as his target".

<sup>23</sup> To put it in simple words, the ingredients are similar, but the dish is quite different. What matters, after all, are not the ingredients, but the dish.

<sup>24</sup> The Latin poet Juvenal speaks of a *rara avis* ["rare bird"] (*Satires*, VI, 165) and of a *corvo quoque rarius albo* ["also rarer white crow"], *Satires* VII, 202. He is quoted by Erasmus (*Adagia*, II, 1.21). I thank A. Nepi for this precise piece of information.

<sup>25</sup> See SCHMID, "Die Rückgabe", 15-18, 24-26.



be interpreted in the same way. It seems more natural to think that Genesis 22 endeavors to attribute to Abraham the foundation of a cult on a mountain which, later on, will be chosen by Solomon as the place to build the temple because the Lord had appeared to his father David in that very place. If 2 Chr 3,1 had known Genesis 22, it would have surely mentioned Abraham before David, as K. Schmid has noticed<sup>26</sup>. This is not the case, however. It means that Genesis 22 is part of those texts that try to attribute to Abraham a role of initiator and founder in many areas of later Jewish religious life.

As a last argument in favor of a late date for Genesis 22, we must say that this text is mentioned for the first time in very late, apocryphal, writings, such as Sir 44,20; Wis 10,5; 1 Macc 2,52 — and all these passages speak of Abraham's test — or in the New Testament (Heb 11,17-18; Jas 2,21-22; perhaps Rom 8,32). Other texts that speak of similar topics, especially child sacrifice, never mention Genesis 22, as for instance Mic 6,7; Lev 18,21; Deut 12,31; 2 Kgs 17,17; Jer 7,31; 19,5; 32,35; Ps 106,37-38. Now, a simple allusion to Genesis 22 would have given a strong argument against this — hypothetical — practice.

In conclusion, Genesis 22 stands alone in the Abraham cycle, as a kind of "white crow". This is an essential element for the interpretation of the text, its dating, and the appraisal of its deep theological meaning.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I – 00187 Rome

Jean Louis SKA

#### SUMMARY

Among the questions raised by Gen 22,1-19, this short study grapples with those concerning the figure of God, the peculiarities of the plot, and the date of the text. God puts Abraham to the test "to know" how the latter will pass this test. The plot is therefore a plot of discovery that ends with an *anagnorisis*, a passage from ignorance to knowledge in 22,12. There is no explicit *peripeteia* in the narrative, however, and this means that the reader must imagine the change of situation. All these features point towards a later date.

---

<sup>26</sup> See SCHMID, "Die Rückgabe", 21.

## RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

### Observations on the 28th Revised Edition of Nestle–Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*

Münster’s Bibel Museum was the setting for the recent presentation of the 28<sup>th</sup> revised edition of Nestle–Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*, the standard, scholarly compact edition of the Greek New Testament. Prof. Dr. Holger Strutwolf, the Director of the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) in Münster, founded by Kurt Aland in 1959 primarily to assemble and catalogue all the extant manuscripts of the New Testament with the goal of producing the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) of the NT, together with Dr. Florian Voss of the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft in Stuttgart, introduced the edition <sup>1</sup>. It was with great enthusiasm, and not without irony, that Professor Strutwolf launched NA 28 <sup>2</sup> with the following reflection: “Der Nestle–Aland — seit vielen Jahrzehnten die maßgebliche wissenschaftliche Ausgabe des griechischen Neuen Testaments, die jeder Theologe kennt oder kennen sollte, die in neutestamentlichen Lehrveranstaltungen in aller Welt benutzt wird, die Pfarrerinnen und Pfarrer überall auf diesem Globus auf ihrem Schreibtisch liegen haben, um ihre Predigten vorzubereiten — liegt nun in einer grundlegend neu bearbeiteten Auflage vor”. It was very unfortunate that Prof. Dr. Barbara Aland, Prof. Strutwolf’s predecessor at the Institute, was unable to attend this event. She was, however, duly acknowledged. Her research on the text of the New Testament has confirmed her as one of the principal driving forces behind this new scholarly edition of the Greek New Testament.

In order to produce NA 28, Professor Strutwolf and his collaborators <sup>3</sup> studied and evaluated hundreds of manuscripts. The readings of several

---

<sup>1</sup> Those familiar with the previous editions will immediately notice the new Extensible Markup Language format (XML). Another material novelty, the Digital Nestle–Aland, will soon be available. It is currently being prepared by the INTF, in collaboration with Scholarly Digital Editions (Birmingham, UK) and the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. This digital version will distinguish itself from the printed edition by offering not only the transcripts and images of the most important NT manuscripts, but will also include an apparatus based on the transcribed manuscripts. The digital form is a work in progress that promises to be revolutionary. See <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/>.

<sup>2</sup> NA = Nestle–Aland

<sup>3</sup> In his presentation, Professor Strutwolf specifically mentioned the indispensable assistance of the following: Luc Herren, Marie-Luise Lakmann, Wolfgang Richter, Beate von Tschischwitz, Florian Voss and Klaus Wachtel.

newly-examined manuscripts, as well as eleven new papyri<sup>4</sup>, were incorporated into this 28<sup>th</sup> edition. The critical apparatus has been entirely reworked and simplified. Many of the references in the outer margins to parallel texts and doublets, Old Testament quotations or allusions, have been thoroughly revised. This enormous and all but impossible task has been accomplished with great accuracy and thoroughness. The editors found no reason to revise the inner marginal notes for this new edition. There are 34 readings in the text of Nestle–Aland 28 which differ (sometimes significantly) from those of the 27<sup>th</sup> edition of 1993.

# I

The first *Novum Testamentum Graece* of Eberhard Nestle (1898) was constructed for the most part from the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott & Hort, and Weymouth. Nestle incorporated the majority reading of these three Greek editions in his text and placed the third reading in the critical apparatus. Bernhard Weiss's 1894/1900 edition eventually replaced that of Weymouth. The edition of 1901 and subsequent editions by Eberhard Nestle offered the reader a rather uncomplicated critical apparatus with references to important manuscripts. Only in 1927 with the edition (13th) of Eberhard Nestle's son Erwin do we encounter an apparatus that contains manuscript readings, early translations and patristic material. This 1927 "Nestle" edition appropriated most of its textual information from earlier editions, especially from that of Hermann von Soden.

Kurt Aland became the associate editor of the 21st edition of "Nestle" (1952). It was due to Aland's contribution that the critical apparatus was significantly expanded and the number of manuscripts that were consulted increased dramatically. The 1952 edition consisted of 137,490 words and 657 pages. The 25<sup>th</sup> edition of 1963 was the last "Nestle". Thereafter, the editions of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* bear the names of both Nestle and Aland.

The 26<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle–Aland (1979) adopted the Aland, Black, Metzger, Wikgren and Martini 1975 edition of the United Bible Society's *Greek New Testament*, an edition that departs radically from those of Eberhard Nestle. 89 papyri and 274 majuscules were consulted and evaluated.

---

The names of many other collaborators are included in Strutwolf's foreword to NA 28. I am especially grateful to H. Strutwolf and K. Wachtel for their willingness to meet with me and answer some of my questions about NA 28.

<sup>4</sup> The eleven new papyri (P<sup>117-127</sup>) used in NA 28 are listed in Appendix I (Codices Graeci) 798-799.

The critical apparatus presents the most important witnesses wherever there is a doubt about the text, and the edition includes an appendix which lists the readings of Tischendorf, Westcott & Hort, von Soden, Vogels, Merk and Bover, as well as those of the 25th edition of Nestle. The 27th edition of Nestle–Aland, published in 1993, had the support of 98 papyri and 300 majuscules. Its text runs to 680 pages and is flanked by several early translations. The Greek text of the 27th edition is the same as that of Nestle–Aland 26 but the critical apparatus was revised extensively. According to the editors, the same text was used because the publication of Nestle–Aland 27 was not “deemed an appropriate occasion for introducing textual changes”<sup>5</sup>.

## II

The 28<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle–Aland has grown to almost 1,000 pages (c. 100 pages more than NA 27) and contains over 12,000 variants. All of the variants have been rigorously checked, and, in some cases, the readings have been improved. The editors had decided that revisions in the critical apparatus were now warranted with the publication of the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Catholic Letters (James, Peter, John and Jude) by the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung<sup>6</sup>. The ECM contains all the available material necessary not only for the reconstruction of the original text of the Greek New Testament (not the recovering of a single original text), but also for the reconstruction of its textual history. Their point of departure is that the text of the Greek New Testament was not written in stone, and the editors have provided us with a text that is not dogmatically immutable but replete with hypotheses for the reader to make important exegetical decisions. The evidence must always be weighed. Textual criticism and biblical exegesis must go hand in hand.

In the judgment of the editors, even though the NA 26 and NA 27 were in themselves very good editions, their *apparatus critici* were in not a few places highly convoluted and at times even incomprehensible for many readers. Prof. Strutwolf noted in his presentation that a reviewer once remarked (negatively) that the critical apparatus of Nestle–Aland was a “Wunder an Kompaktheit” and that not a few scholars had complained that the apparatus was indeed so compact, so dense and contained so much in-

---

<sup>5</sup> NA 27, 45\*

<sup>6</sup> B. ALAND, K. ALAND †, G. MINK, H. STRUTWOLF, K. WACHTEL, *Novum Testamentum Graecum — Editio Critica Maior IV. Die Katholischen Briefe* (Stuttgart 2012). The ECM of the *Acts of the Apostles* is in preparation.

formation that it was often difficult to use and understand <sup>7</sup>. These criticisms, according to Strutwolf, warranted a thorough re-working of the critical apparatus to make it more readable and user-friendly. The new edition has accomplished this brilliantly.

As is the case with every critical edition, be it that of the Bible or that of a classical author, the introduction to the edition is of utmost importance for understanding the methodology and critical technique(s) adopted by the editor(s). Whether the edition at hand is a Teubner classical text or a volume of the Göttingen Septuagint or an edition of the Vetus Latina, a thorough familiarity with the information provided in the introduction is an absolute prerequisite. The reader of the apparatus must be sufficiently acquainted with the pertinent sections of the introduction to be able to find an explanation or a discussion of an editor's critical choices and *modus interpretandi*.

The introduction to Nestle-Aland 28, not unlike that of previous editions, abounds in useful information. For the most part, the editors have succinctly presented helpful indications and clarifications for using the edition. The section entitled *Revision and Correction of the Critical Apparatus of the Whole Edition* (2.1), pp. 48\*-50\*, briefly indicates some of the most important changes and/or improvements: abandonment of the distinction between “consistently cited witnesses of the first and second order”; the apparatus has been rearranged “for more tightness and clarity”; the notes of the critical apparatus were “checked systematically”; this new apparatus, unlike those of the previous editions, no longer contains conjectures <sup>8</sup>; the treatment of *inscriptio* and *subscriptio* has been altered; the terms *pauci* (*pc*) and *alii* (*al*) have been abandoned; the former usage of indicating the concatenation of entries in the critical apparatus by the words *et* or *sed* is no longer employed and the earlier attested concatenations are now cited separately, while the abbreviation *cf* “points to possible relations between variants”; a general list of abbreviations is provided in Appendix IV; there is a complete revision of the “apparatus of references

---

<sup>7</sup> A similar criticism was expressed about the Göttingen Septuagint editions by Dr. Martin West. In April 2008, on the occasion of the centenary of Septuaginta-Unternehmen zu Göttingen, during a conference on the *apparatus criticus* of the Göttingen LXX, “Die Göttinger Septuaginta-Ausgabe — Standortbestimmung eines editorischen Jahrhundertprojekts”, West presented a paper entitled “Critical Editing” in which he argued in favor of a shorter and less detailed apparatus. Specialists in the field of Septuagint studies resisted and rejected his appeal.

<sup>8</sup> There is an ambitious project underway at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam which will provide a listing of all the conjectures printed in the previous editions of Nestle-Aland.

in the outer margin”; Appendix III in Nestle–Aland 27, the so-called *Editionum Differentiae*, is not included in NA 28 “because the effort of revising it would not have been in reasonable proportion to its prospective usefulness”, but a more efficient tool for indexing the variants will be a component of the forthcoming digital edition of Nestle–Aland 28.

NA 28’s apparatus is richer and more accurate, according to the editors, because of the material appropriated from the *Editio Critica Maior*<sup>9</sup>. However, Section 2.2.2, *Defining the Consistently Cited Witnesses for the Catholic Letters*, (p. 52\*), is unfortunately rather obscure and too succinct to be of any real value. A more detailed explanation of certain technical terms (“coherence method”, “potential ancestor”) would have been helpful. Likewise, other details on p. 52\*, such as “the initial *A* text” (“Ausgangstext” p. 7\* of the German edition), which is essentially the reconstructed text, the form from which the transmission of the text started, should be developed and clarified<sup>10</sup>. The editors have re-evaluated many of the assumptions of modern New Testament textual criticism and direct the reader to an important paper by Gerd Mink which explains the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) that is the basis of their examination of the validity of their text-critical decisions<sup>11</sup>, but the all too brief paragraph in the introduction (p. 52\*) should be expanded to provide the reader with the fundamental elements of this methodology, whose goal is to arrive at a comprehensive history of the text and an overview of all the judgments made, to perceive their direction, and identify by means of a global stemma the genealogical structures between the texts that have been transmitted by the manuscripts.

---

<sup>9</sup> NA 28, 48\*: “The Catholic Letters were revised according to a fundamentally new concept which in the long run will be adopted for the entire edition”.

<sup>10</sup> The introduction in English refers to an “*a*” text (p. 52\*). This must be a misprint. The German text (p. 8\*) continues to employ “*A*”. For a precise definition of the “Ausgangstext”, see G. MINK, “Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition, the New Testament: Stemmata of Variants as a Source of a Genealogy for Witnesses”, *Studies in Stemmatology II* (eds. P. VAN REENAN – A. DEN HOLLANDER – M. VAN MULKEN) (Amsterdam – Philadelphia 2004) 25.

<sup>11</sup> G. MINK, “Contamination, Coherence and Coincidence in Textual Transmission: The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) as a Complement and Corrective to Existing Approaches”, *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament* (eds. K. WACHTEL – M. HOLMES) (SBL Text-Critical Studies 8; Atlanta 2011) 141–216. G. Mink was the pre-eminent theoretician of this method. See also [http://www.uni-muenster.de/NTTextforschung/cbgm\\_presentation/](http://www.uni-muenster.de/NTTextforschung/cbgm_presentation/). His power-point presentation of his research at the 2008 Münster Colloquium on the Textual History of the Greek New Testament abounds in examples that are illustrated graphically and with great thoroughness.

The method is grounded in philological reasoning. Its objective is not to make text-critical decisions but rather to examine the validity of such decisions<sup>12</sup>. Without a proper understanding of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method, the 28th revised edition of Nestle–Aland will remain enigmatic and even problematic.

Scholars of the NT are confronted with an enormous amount of material. More than 130 papyri and more than 270 uncial manuscripts, as well as around 2,800 cursive manuscripts, are at the editors' disposal. There are more than 2,200 lectionaries that contain various parts of the NT. Four extant manuscripts contain the entire Bible and around 60 manuscripts contain the entire NT. We have more or less 2,000 manuscripts that contain the Gospels. What is disconcerting is that no two texts are in complete agreement. This makes the process of examining the validity of text-critical decisions extremely complex. The editors of NA 28 are very helpful, on the other hand, when they provide the reader with information about important witnesses that were evaluated or re-evaluated and then appropriated into this new Nestle–Aland. Details about the weight of the minuscules in particular help us to make methodological advances, namely to discern genealogical connections among the manuscripts. For example, it is important that the reader be made aware of the weight of MS 468 and of the even more important MS 307, both Byzantine texts. In the same way, we are informed that MS 88 is essential for the Letter of Jude, as is MS 1881 for First John. The editors often cite MS 33 for its "interesting special readings" (p. 52\*). MSS 1448 and 1611 transmit the important text translated by Thomas of Harkel in 616 A.D. Another MS important for the Catholic Letters is 642 "because it documents the text of a group of late Byzantine witnesses, a text with several peculiarities" (52\*)<sup>13</sup>. Unlike the minuscules,

---

<sup>12</sup> H. Strutwolf informed me that he will be writing a companion volume to NA 28 in order to explain in detail, and in more simple language, the methodological basis for the editors' textual choices. David Trobisch is preparing a volume that will offer a thorough explanation of the structure and function of the critical apparatus and appendices in NA 28.

<sup>13</sup> K. ALAND – B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament*. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI 1989) 128: "There is admittedly a whole group of minuscules that have long been recognized for the importance of their texts (e.g., 33 has long been called "Queen of the minuscules"). But most of the minuscules have not yet been examined for their textual value (at least half of them are certainly underrated) simply because the examination of 2,812 manuscripts is beyond the capacity of any one scholar, or even a team of scholars, unless equipped with a method to produce reliable results without having to compare them in every sentence ... But approxi-



the papyri are essentially individual witnesses that do not enable us to establish any direct genealogical links. They are important, however, and all of the papyri (listed on p. 53\*) that contain the text of the Catholic Letters are included in the *apparatus criticus* of NA 28. On pages 62\*-67\* of the introduction, there is a list of all the consistently cited witnesses of the Gospels, Acts, Pauline corpus and Catholic Letters. An important papyrus that is consistently cited in Acts is P<sup>127</sup> (P.Oxy. 4968). The editors say nothing in their introduction about its significance. I will discuss the value and relevance of this papyrus below.

NA 28 has consciously excluded several manuscripts that are now considered “marginal”. For example, at James 1,1 we read Ἰάκωβος Θεοῦ <sup>†</sup> in NA 27 with the following comment in the apparatus: <sup>†</sup> πατρος 429. 614. 630 *pc.* Nestle–Aland 28 still reads, of course, Ἰάκωβος Θεοῦ but does not insert the critical sign <sup>†</sup> after Θεοῦ, which means that NA 28 no longer includes πατρος in its critical apparatus. The completion of the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Catholic Letters has allowed the editors to no longer make mention of several marginal manuscripts. MS 429 is very late (14th/15th centuries), as is 630 (14th century). MS 614 from the 13th century was formerly considered of importance because of its possible relation to the D text.

A list of the differences between the readings of Nestle–Aland 27 and 28 which have been derived from the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Catholic Letters is presented on pages 50\*-51\* of the introduction (see chart below). The new readings of the Catholic Letters should be carefully pondered. Some of these new readings might seem at first to be of no real importance. If, however, one accepts the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method used by the editors that places less emphasis on the manuscripts themselves and gives more weight to the states of the text, which might be considerably older than a particular manuscript, the new readings are not without significance.

---

mately 10 percent of them offer a valuable early text which can compete with even the best of the uncials. The ‘Queen’ now has many rivals, a number of which are of superior value”.

		ECM/NA 28	NA 27
James	1,20	οὐ κατεργάζεται	οὐκ ἐργάζεται
	2,3	ἢ κάθου ἐκεῖ	ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθου
	2,4	καὶ οὐ διεκρίθητε	οὐ διεκρίθητε
	2,15	λειπόμενοι ὧσιν	λειπόμενοι
	4,10	τοῦ κυρίου	κυρίου
1 Pet	1,6	λυπηθέντας	λυπηθέντες
	1,16	—	[ὅτι]
	1,16	—	[εἰμι]
	2,5	—	[τῷ]
	2,25	ἀλλ'	ἀλλά
	4,16	μέρει	ὀνόματι
	5,1	τούς	οὖν
	5,9	—	[τῷ]
	5,10	—	[Ἰησοῦ]
2 Pet	2,6	ἀσεβεῖν	ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν
	2,11	παρὰ κυρίῳ	παρὰ κυρίου
	2,15	καταλιπόντες	καταλείποντες
	2,18	ὄντως	ὀλίγως
	2,20	—	[ἡμῶν]
	3,6	δι' ὃν	δι' ὧν
	3,10	οὐχ εὐρεθήσεται	εὐρεθήσεται
	3,16	ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς	ἐπιστολαῖς
	3,16	στρεβλώσουσιν	στρεβλοῦσιν
	3,18	—	[ἀμὴν]
1 John	1,7	—	δέ
	3,7	παιδιά	τεκνία
	5,10	ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν ἑαυτῷ
	5,18	ἑαυτόν	αὐτόν
2 John	5	γράφω σοι καινὴν	καινὴν γράφων σοι
	12	ἡ πεπληρωμένη	πεπληρωμένη ἡ
3 John	4	ἀληθεία	τῇ ἀληθείᾳ
Jude	5	ἅπας πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς	πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπας
	18	—	[ὅτι]
	18	—	[τοῦ]

An analysis of some of these variants is in order to see how and why several new readings have been adopted in this new edition. For the most part, however, many of the changes in NA 28 are purely formal and consist simply of a different word order (James 2,3: ἡ κάθου ἐκεῖ instead of ἐκεῖ ἡ κάθου; 2 John 5: γράφων σοι καινὴν where NA 27 reads καινὴν γράφων σοι; 2 John 12: ἡ πεπληρωμένη as opposed to πεπληρωμένη ἡ) or the absence or presence of an article (James 4,10: τοῦ κυρίου (NA 28); 1 Pet 5,9: [τῷ] (NA 27); 2 Pet 3,16: ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (NA 28); 3 John 4: τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (NA 27)). The text of James 2,15 now contains the periphrastic construction λειπόμενοι ὧσιν and no longer the participle λειπόμενοι alone. At 1 Pet 1,6 NA 28 prints the accusative λυπηθέντας instead of the nominative λυπηθέντες and the contracted form ἀλλ' is preferred to ἀλλά at 1 Pet 2,25. NA 27's ὀνόματι has been replaced by μέρει at 1 Pet 4,16 and the reading οὖν at 1 Pet 5,1 is now τοὺς in NA 28. The readings at 2 Pet 18 have no relation to each other: NA 27 reads the adverb ὀλίγως while NA 28 has a different adverb, ὅντως. The adjective ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν in NA 27 has been abandoned for the infinitive ἀσεβεῖν at 2 Pet 2,6. Other minor variants are as follows: the use of παρά with the dative κυρίῳ (NA 28) as opposed to the genitive κυρίου at 2 Pet 2,11; the aorist participle καταλιπόντες instead of NA 27's present participle καταλείποντες at 2 Pet 2,15; NA 27 prints εὐρεθήσεται while NA 28 has opted for οὐχ εὐρεθήσεται at 2 Pet 3,10; at 2 Pet 3,16 NA 28 reads the future indicative στρεβλώσουσιν instead of NA 27's present indicative στρεβλοῦσιν. We have attestations in NA 28 of the irregular usage of the reflexive pronoun in Hellenistic Greek: ἐν ἑαυτῷ at 1 John 5,10 and ἑαυτόν at 1 John 5,18.

The following three examples (James 1,20; 1 John 3,7; Jude 5) merit closer attention. The textual choices of the editors can only be understood in light of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method. For all three examples, I first present the NA 27 Greek text and apparatus and then the NA 28 text and its apparatus.

#### James 1,20 (NA 27)

ὁργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ 'οὐκ ἐργάζεται'

(NA 27)

‘ου κατεργ. C\* P 0246. 1739 ℣ | txt ⚭ A B C<sup>3</sup> K Ψ 69. 81 al; Did

#### James 1,20 (NA 28)

ὁργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ 'οὐ κατεργάζεται'

## (NA 28)

‘οὐκ ἐργάζεται Ɀ A B C<sup>3</sup> Ψ 5. 81. 436. 442. 2344; Did | κατεργάζεται 2492\* | txt C\* P 307. 642. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1735. 1739. 1852. 2492<sup>c</sup> Byz

The *forma simplex* ἐργάζεται (NA 27) does not differ in meaning here from the *forma complex* κατεργάζεται (NA 28). The Greek of the New Testament and the Septuagint, as well as that of Hellenistic writers such as Flavius Josephus, frequently demonstrates a tendency to prefer a variety of verbal forms sometimes with and sometimes without a prefix. The compound forms are often employed purely for stylistic reasons, for *varietas locutionis*. A prefix does not always add a semantic nuance to the base lexeme <sup>14</sup>.

The reader of NA 28's apparatus to 1 James 20 is most likely to be perplexed initially at the editors' choice of κατεργάζεται over ἐργάζεται, given the fact that ἐργάζεται is attested in important witnesses such as *Sinaiticus* (Ɀ), *Alexandrinus* (A), *Vaticanus* (B), as well as C<sup>3</sup> Ψ 5. 81. 436. 442. and 2344. It cannot be repeated too often that, according to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method adopted by the editors, *codices* Ɀ, A and B do not automatically take preference over all other witnesses. The state of the text that the manuscripts convey, and not the manuscripts in and by themselves, is the essential element of a genealogical hypothesis. The reading κατεργάζεται likewise has some excellent witnesses such as *Ephraemi Rescriptus* (C) and 1739. In addition, other witnesses include *codices* 1448 and 1611, two representatives of the group of manuscripts which transmit the text translated by Thomas of Harkel in 616 A.D. (p. 52\*), as well as many traces of the Byzantine tradition. MS 307, for example, is a Byzantine text from the 10th century, which “represents an early branch of the Byzantine tradition which diverges from the mainstream” (p. 52\*). Another important Byzantine text, codex 642, is one of the constantly cited witnesses “because it documents the text of a group of late Byzantine witnesses, a text with several peculiarities” (p. 52\*). Many of these witnesses should be taken no less seriously than the fourth-century *codices* mentioned above. What has to be analysed is the way in which the variants compare with each other. Given this plethora of outstanding witnesses and the impossibility of giving absolute preference to any particular group of witnesses, the editors have consistently followed

<sup>14</sup> For examples in Josephus, v. A.J. FORTE, “Translating Book 1 of Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum*: Some Critical Observations”, *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (eds. J. SIEVERS – G. LEMBI) (Leiden 2005) 383–403.

the category of Transcriptional Probability<sup>15</sup>. In our text (1 James 20), it is *probabilior* that in the row of letters ΟΥΚΑΤΕΡΓΑΖΕΤΑΙ the letters ΑΤ fell out so as to give us ΟΥΚΕΡΓΑΖΕΤΑΙ. It is much *less probable* that the two letters ΑΤ were somehow added to the row of letters. We very often see this phenomenon of omissions of small sections of a text, even in *Codex Vaticanus*, whereby the omission does not significantly alter the meaning of the text. It is obvious that the three letters ΟΥΚ make up a word that has a meaning and that if the letters ΑΤ fell out, the *lectio facilior* would be comprised of οὐκ and ἐργάζεται. The reading chosen by the editors, οὐ κατεργάζεται, can be understood as the *lectio difficilior*.

1 John 3,7 (NA 27)

Ἐτεκνία, ἡμεῖς πλανᾷτω ὑμᾶς· ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστιν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν·

(NA 27)

Ἐπαιδία Α Ρ Ψ 33. 323. 945. 1241. 1739 *al sy*<sup>hmg</sup> (C *illeg.*)

1 John 3,7 (NA 28)

Ἐπαιδία, ἡμεῖς πλανᾷτω ὑμᾶς· ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστιν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν·

(NA 28)

Ἐτεκνία ⚭ B 81. 642. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1852. 2492 Byz *sy*<sup>h</sup> | τεκνία μου 307. 442 | *txt* A C<sup>vid</sup> Ρ Ψ 5. 33. 436. 1735. 1739. 1881. 2344 *sy*<sup>hmg</sup>

The reader of this new edition might perhaps initially be somewhat taken aback (and even displeased) by the choice of the reading παιδία. Its witnesses (A C<sup>vid</sup> Ρ Ψ 5. 33. 436. 1735. 1739. 1881. 2344 *sy*<sup>hmg</sup>) seem at first glance to be inferior to those which read τεκνία (⚭ B 81. 642. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1852. 2492 Byz *sy*<sup>h</sup>). This is not the case. Even though *Vaticanus* does not read παιδία, *codices Alexandrinus*, *Ephraemi Rescriptus*<sup>vid</sup>, Ρ, Ψ, and other important witnesses, most notably MS 1881,

<sup>15</sup> B.F. WESTCOTT – F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. I-II<sup>o</sup> (Cambridge – London<sup>2</sup> 1896). Hort's discussion of Transcriptional Probability can be found in his introduction, volume 2, 22-30. See below for the suggestion that Transcriptional Probability (TP) be noted in the *apparatus criticus* to indicate those instances where the *lectio difficilior*, although supported by fewer witnesses, is probably the original reading.

do so. Nine out of the eighteen manuscripts cited on p. 52\* (Σ, A, B, C, P, Ψ, 048, 5, 81, 436, 442, 1175, 1243, 1735, 1739, 1852, 2344, 2492) read παιδίᾱ. The editors of NA 28 consider these eighteen MSS as the most important witnesses for the construction of the text, the initial *A* text (Ausgangstext). There are 6 attestations of τεκνία in First John (2,1.12.28; 3,18; 4,4; 5,21) and 2 more occurrences of παιδίᾱ (2,14.18) in this Letter. The tendency is to standardize the text by preferring τεκνία to παιδίᾱ. We must point out that παιδίᾱ in these passages is not marked by any important variants. The editors chose the *lectio difficilior*, παιδίᾱ, in accordance with Hort's Transcriptional Probability. Once again, the editors have provided the reader with a text that is not necessarily more "certain", but one which allows the reader to weigh the evidence of the different possible readings for making an exegetical decision.

#### Jude 5 (NA 27)

Ὑπομνήσαι Ἐδὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι<sup>†</sup>, εἰδότας ὅ[υμᾶς] ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ<sup>†</sup> λαὸν ἐκ Ῥῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν

#### (NA 27)

ἅπαξ τουτο (τ. απ.: K) οτι ο κυριος K M | απ. παντα οτι Ιησους A B 33. 81. 2344 *pc* vg | απ. π. οτι θεος Χριστος P<sup>72c</sup> (\*: παντας) | απ. π. οτι ο θ. C<sup>2</sup> 623 *vg*<sup>ms</sup> | † π. οτι κυριος απ. Σ Ψ (1241. 1739. 1881 *pc* co; Or<sup>1739mg</sup>: Ιησους) | *txt* C\* 630. 1505 *pc* sy<sup>h</sup> (1243. 1846 *pc* *vg*<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>ph</sup>; (Cl): ο θεος)

#### Jude 5 (NA 28)

Ὑπομνήσαι Ἐδὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι<sup>†</sup>, εἰδότας ὅτι ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς<sup>†</sup> λαὸν ἐκ Ῥῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν

#### (NA 28)

ὑμας παντα οτι κυριος απαξ Σ | υμας απαξ τουτο οτι ο κυριος 1175. 1448 Byz | απαξ παντα (τουτο 5) οτι ο θεος C<sup>2</sup> 5 *vg*<sup>ms</sup> | απαξ τουτο οτι ο κυριος 307. 436. 642 | παντα οτι ο θεος απαξ 442. 1243. 2492 *vg*<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>ph</sup>; (Cl) | παντα οτι ο (- Ψ) κυριος απαξ Ψ 1611 *latt* sy<sup>h</sup> | απαξ παντα (παντας P<sup>72c</sup>) οτι θεος Χριστος P<sup>72c</sup> | απαξ παντα οτι (+ ο 33\*) Ιησους A 33. 81. 2344 *vg* | παντα οτι ο Ιησους απαξ 88 *sa*<sup>ms</sup>? bo? | παντα οτι Ιησους απαξ 1739<sup>txt</sup> *sa*<sup>ms</sup>? bo?; Or<sup>1739mg</sup> | απαξ τουτο οτι κυριος Ιησους 1735 | παντα απαξ γαρ Ιησους 1739<sup>v.l.</sup> | *txt* B

The texts of Jude 5 differ significantly in the two editions. Leaving aside the problematic ὑμᾶς in both versions and the potentially interesting exegetical problem due to the word order of ἅπαξ, NA 27 reads πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ, attested in C\* 630. 1505 *pc sy*<sup>h</sup> (1243. 1846 *pc vg*<sup>ms</sup> *sy*<sup>ph</sup>; (C1): ο θεος). The witnesses such as *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus*, MSS 630 and 1243 are quite good. The new edition, however, prints ἅπαξ πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς, that is, ἅπαξ is now connected to πάντα and the reading Ἰησοῦς replaces κύριος, which is attested in *codices Alexandrinus* (A), *Vaticanus* (B), 33 (the so-called “Queen of the minuscules”), 81, 2344 and the Vulgate. The reading Χριστος — ἀπαξ παντα οτι θεος Χριστος — in the 3rd/4th century  $\Psi$ <sup>72</sup> was an additional argument in favor of printing Ἰησοῦς against κύριος, despite the presence of κύριος in *Codex Sinaiticus* (Σ), K,  $\mathfrak{M}$ , 1448 and 1611 (two manuscripts that “represent the well-known group of manuscripts transmitting the text translated by Thomas of Harkel in 616”, p. 52\*), 307, 436, 642 (“a miniscule from the 14th century ... numbered among the consistently cited witnesses because it documents the text of a group of late Byzantine witnesses”, p. 52\*) and other witnesses. It should be noted that the reading Ἰησους was included in the *apparatus criticus* of NA 27. It is not a new discovery. The methods employed for judging the validity of readings, however, have been re-evaluated and radically altered.

#### IV

Section II of the introduction (pp. 54\*-55\*) is entitled *The Text of the Edition*. The “goals and methods” of NA 28 are outlined in the first part of this section. The editors explain that their text is “an eclectic text reconstructed from the tradition by means of a combination of external and internal criteria”. Internal criteria are “based on the intrinsic coherence of the text, its grammatical structure and its stylistic, linguistic and theological features”. External criteria concern the “quality and reliability of the witnesses supporting a variant”. These external criteria do not differ from those of NA 27, except for the Catholic Letters, due to the significant amount of material that was gathered and available from the *Editio Critica Maior*.

The second part of Section II describes the “critical signs used in the text”. NA 28 continues to appropriate the traditional critical signs that previous editions have used to indicate omissions, replacements, insertions, transpositions, punctuation and the like. The critical signs in NA 28 are much more legible and easier on the eye. Unfortunately, square brackets in the text ([ ]), except in the case of the Catholic Letters, are still used to indicate that the reading at hand (a single word or several words) is problematic and open to discussion. In this way the editors convey the uncertainty that some scholars have about the authenticity of the



reading and the brackets reflect the difficulty in determining the text. The use of square brackets is in my view unfortunate because the presence of square brackets in classical texts usually indicates that the bracketed text has been deleted by the editor and is therefore not to be read. I will return to this problem below.

The symbol ♦ (diamond) is a new element among the critical signs used in the NA text, and it is this sign that “indicates passages where the guiding line is split in the second edition of the ECM, because there are two variants which in the editors’ judgment could equally well be adopted in the reconstructed initial text” (p. 55\*). For example, in NA 28 James 1,22 is printed as follows: Γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου καὶ μὴ ♦ μόνον ἀκροαταὶ<sup>1</sup> παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοῦς. The transposition of the words μόνον ἀκροαταὶ to μόνον ἀκροαταὶ μόνον is formulated in the critical apparatus (♠ B 1448. 1611. 1852 latt sy). That is, the diamond indicates that both variants could equally well be adopted, and are so in the second edition of the Catholic Letters in the *Editio Critica Maior*<sup>16</sup>.

Whereas NA 27 (p. 80\*) used three different asterisks — \* (\*) [\*] — in Appendix I (Codices Graeci et Latini) to indicate various orders of the cited witnesses, NA 28 uses a simple asterisk: “Consistently cited witnesses are signalled by a preceding \*. If a manuscript is consistently cited for single writings only, the respective writings are marked by \* in the fourth column” (p. 86\*).

Section III (The Critical Apparatus) of the introduction (pp. 55\*-81\*) presents a long list of “critical signs” as well as some brief comments on the “organization of the apparatus”. There are no significant changes between NA 27 and NA 28 in these two categories. NA 28’s next sub-section, “presentation of various readings and witnesses”, (pp. 58\*-60\*), had previously consisted of two separate headings in NA 27: “presentation of variant readings”, (pp. 53\*-54\*), and “presentation of witnesses” (pp. 54\*-56\*). There are some slight changes. NA 27’s usage of abbreviations of Greek words in the critical apparatus that are found in the body of the text (p. 53\*) has been eliminated in the NA 28 edition. For example, instead of printing Μ-σην and Μ-ση in the critical apparatus to Matt 1,10, NA 28 departs from NA 27 (and previous editions) by printing the entire words (Μαννασην and Μανασση) in the apparatus. An example from Mark 3,11 is as follows. We are interested in the text that begins with ἐθεώρουν and ends with λέγοντες.

<sup>16</sup> Besides James 1,22, the following passages are marked by a diamond in NA 28: James 2,11; 3,4; 4,9.12.14; 5,4.18; 1 Pet 1,22; 2,12; 3,5.20; 4,11; 5,9.10.11.14; 2 Pet 1,4 (2 x).5.9.21; 2,3.11.22; 3,3.10; 1 John 1,4.7.8; 2,4.6.17.29; 4,12.20; 5,6.11.21; 2 John 9.12; Jude 17.18.

## Mark 3,11 (NA 27/28)

καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ  
 \* καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

(NA 27)

ἐθεωρει, προσεπιπτεν α. και εκραζειν λεγοντα E H 700 *pm* | εθ-ρει, πρ-  
 πτον (-πτεν *f*<sup>1</sup>) α. κ. εκραζον λεγοντα (-ντες K) A K P Γ *f*<sup>1</sup> l 2211 *pm* | †  
*ut txt, sed* λεγοντα B C L Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 892. 1241. 1424. 2427. (2542)  
*pm* | *txt* & D (W) 28. 579 *pc*

(NA 28)

ἐθεωρει προσεπιπτεν αυτω και εκραζειν λεγοντα 700 *pm* | εθεωρει  
 προσεπιπτον (προσεπιπτεν *f*<sup>1</sup>) αυτω και εκραζον λεγοντα (λεγοντες K)  
 A K P (Γ) *f*<sup>1</sup> l 2211 *pm* | l-5 λεγοντα &<sup>2</sup> B C L Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 892.  
 1241. 1424. (2542) *pm*

Both apparatuses concentrate essentially on the readings in Mark 3,11 that begin with ἐθεώρουν and end with λέγοντες ('ἐθεώρουν — λέγοντες'). NA 27 and 28 both indicate that MS 700 and many other witnesses (*pm*) read ἐθεωρει προσεπιπτεν αυτω και εκραζειν λεγοντα. All of the verbal forms are in the singular and the only differences between NA 27 and 28 here is that NA 28 writes out αυτω instead of merely abbreviating it (α.). In addition, NA 28 does not include MSS E and H in its apparatus. Both of these MSS are "defective", that is, they are incompletely preserved (pp. 799\*-800\*). In the next entry, while NA 27 had printed εθ-ρει, πρ-πτον (-πτεν *f*<sup>1</sup>) α. κ. εκραζον λεγοντα (-ντες K), NA 28 presents the *forma lunga*: ἐθεώρουν προσέπιπτον (προσεπιπτεν *f*<sup>1</sup>) αυτω και εκραζον λεγοντα (λεγοντες K). This change by the editors, which helps make the apparatus less cumbersome and more attractive to the eye, is one of the reasons why NA 28 contains around 100 pages more than the 27th edition. NA 27 had listed Γ as a witness (along with A K P *f*<sup>1</sup> l 2211 *pm*), but NA 28 puts Γ in parenthesis (Γ) to indicate that it is a witness with slightly different readings. Instead of adopting NA 27's usage of † to denote a change in the text from the 25th edition, where the reading thus marked stood in the text (*ut txt*), NA 28 avoids this convention as well as NA 27's *sed λεγοντα* with its witnesses by noting that the five words in the text (l-5) — ἐθεώρουν προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον — plus λέγοντα have the following witnesses &<sup>2</sup> B C L Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 892. 1241. 1424. (2542). NA 27 had indicated that the text of Mark 3,11 (*txt*) was attested in & D (W) 28. 579 *pc*. NA 28, on the other hand, lists the following witnesses for the text of Mark 3,11: &<sup>2</sup>c D (28). 579. This is a significantly less awkward

presentation than what we have in NA 27's critical apparatus. Among the witnesses, the only significant difference is that NA 28 discards 2427 entirely from the edition, a MS previously listed in NA 27, preceded by an asterisk (\*), as a consistently cited witness for single writings only.

An example of how the apparatus of NA 28 is a major improvement over that of NA 27 is found at Matt 15,35-36. The Greek text below is the same for both versions and the apparatus in NA 28 is instantly and perfectly comprehensible.

Matt 15,35-36 (NA 27/28)

35 καὶ ᾠ παραγγείλας (τῷ ὄχλῳ) ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν 36 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἐπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας

(NA 27)

35/36 ἑκελευσε *et* καὶ λαβὼν C L W  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> | εκ. *et* καὶ ἐλαβε 700. (892<sup>c</sup>) *pc* sy<sup>s.c.p</sup> | *txt*  $\propto$  B D  $\Theta$  f<sup>1.13</sup> 33. 579. 892\* *pc*

(NA 28)

35 ἑκελευσεν C K L N P W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  565. 700. 892<sup>c</sup>. 1241. 1424. / 2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy | *txt*  $\propto$  B D  $\Theta$  f<sup>1.13</sup> 33. 579. 892\*<sup>vid</sup> (*cf vs* 36  $\Gamma$ )

36 καὶ λαβὼν C K L N P W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  565. 1241. 1424. / 2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> | καὶ ἐλαβε 700 sy<sup>s.c.p</sup> | ἐλαβεν δε 892 | *txt*  $\propto$  B D  $\Theta$  f<sup>1.13</sup> 33. 579 (*cf vs* 35  $\Gamma$ )

The most evident improvement in NA 28 was the decision to separate the two verses in the critical apparatus. Instead of informing the reader of the witnesses that the two variants, ἐκελευσε (v. 35) and καὶ λαβὼν (v. 36), have in common (C L W  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup>), NA 28 departs from NA 27 by printing the variant of παραγγείλας, ἐκελευσεν instead of ἐκελευσε, lists all the witnesses to ἐκελευσεν (C K L N P W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  565. 700. 892<sup>c</sup>. 1241. 1424. / 2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy) and separately enumerates the witnesses to καὶ λαβὼν, the variant of ἔλαβεν: C K L N P W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  565. 1241. 1424. / 2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup>. NA 28 also treats the reading καὶ ἐλαβε separately by noting its witnesses (700 sy<sup>s.c.p</sup>) and does not confuse the reader with the not immediately comprehensible apparatus found in NA 27: εκ. *et* καὶ ἐλαβε 700. (892<sup>c</sup>) *pc* sy<sup>s.c.p</sup>. NA 28 adds another reading (ἐλαβεν δε) attested in 892 (9th century). By having combined verses 35 and 36, NA 27 was able to indicate the witnesses to the text of both verses once: *txt*  $\propto$  B D  $\Theta$  f<sup>1.13</sup> 33. 579. 892\* *pc*. The Greek text of both verses 35 and 36 has to be noted in the apparatus of this new version. This is not at all cumbersome. There are two minor new elements: the editors have added *ut videtur* to the original reading of MS 892 (892\*<sup>vid</sup>) and they no longer use the abbreviation *pc* (*pauci*).

Another aid in presenting a less overloaded apparatus is NA 28's decision to give less weight to numerals written in italics that indicate a difference in word order (p. 58\*). In NA 27 and 28 Luke 22,24 reads as follows: 'Εγένετο 'δὲ καὶ' φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς 'αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι' μείζων. NA 27's apparatus for this verse (p. 233) cites the following witnesses for the reading δὲ καί: '2 *℘*<sup>75</sup> | 1 *ℵ* it vg<sup>mss</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>. The editors of NA 27 (p. 53\*) explain that their apparatus "means that for the text of Luke 22,24 'δὲ καὶ', the reading witnessed by *℘*<sup>75</sup> is καί, and the reading of *ℵ* is δέ". The apparatus of NA 28 (p. 276) for this verse is straightforward and is to be preferred: 'καὶ *℘*<sup>75</sup> | δέ *ℵ* vg<sup>mss</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>. The editors of NA 28 have not found it necessary to provide an explanation of this verse's apparatus.

A more interesting example is found in First Corinthians.

1 Cor 15,51 (NA 27/28)

ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω· <sup>τ</sup> πάντες <sup>τ</sup> οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἁλλαγησόμεθα

(NA 27)

'2 *1 3 4* *ℵ* C 0243\*. 33. 1241<sup>s</sup>. 1739 *pc*; Hier<sup>mss</sup> (A\*: οἱ *loco* ου) | ου κοι., ου π. δε *℘*<sup>46</sup> A<sup>c</sup> (F G: οὖν κοι.) | ἀναστησόμεθα, ου π. δε D\* lat; Tert Ambst Spec | *txt* B D<sup>2</sup> Ψ 075. 0243. 1881 *ℳ* sy co; Hier<sup>mss</sup>

(NA 28)

'κοιμηθησόμεθα ου (οἱ A\*) παντες δε *ℵ* A\* C 0243\*. 33. 1241. 1739; Hier<sup>mss</sup> | ου (οὖν F G) κοιμηθησόμεθα ου παντες δε *℘*<sup>46</sup> A<sup>c</sup> F G | ἀναστησόμεθα ου παντες δε D\* lat; Tert Ambst Spec | *txt* B D<sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 075. 0243<sup>c</sup>. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 1881. 2464. *ℳ* sy co; Hier<sup>mss</sup>

Although NA 27's critical apparatus at 1 Cor 15,51 is not complicated, it is not immediately comprehensible. The section of the Greek text that interests us is οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα πάντες δέ. The first part of NA 27's apparatus concerning these four words presents the witnesses and some variations in the Greek text as follows: '2 *1 3 4* *ℵ* C 0243\*. 33. 1241<sup>s</sup>. 1739 *pc*; Hier<sup>mss</sup> (A\*: οἱ *loco* ου). There is considerable improvement in NA 28's critical apparatus due to the more simple and straightforward presentation, the result of which fosters instant comprehensibility. The new apparatus reads 'κοιμηθησόμεθα ου (οἱ A\*) παντες δε *ℵ* A\* C 0243\*. 33. 1241. 1739; Hier<sup>mss</sup>. The numbers in italics (*2 1 3 4*) used to indicate word order in NA 27 are no longer employed. They are unnecessary and cumbersome. Instead, the text is not only presented with the word order written out in

full in NA 28's apparatus but, in addition, the variant  $\omicron\iota$  (A\*) is neatly sandwiched in between  $\omicron\upsilon$  and  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , instead of adopting NA 27's rather awkward entry (A\*:  $\omicron\iota$  *loco*  $\omicron\upsilon$ ). Note that the letter "s" (*supplementum* = reading in a supplemental part of a manuscript) used in NA 27 after MS 1241 (1241<sup>s</sup>) has been omitted by NA 28. Likewise, the abbreviation *pc*, as in the previous example, has been discarded in the new version.

The next difference between the apparatuses of NA 27 and NA 28 is most evident. NA 27's entry is not incomprehensible but not instantly clear. It reads as follows:  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\kappa\omicron\iota\iota$ .,  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\pi$ .  $\delta\epsilon$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A<sup>c</sup> (F G:  $\omicron\upsilon\iota\iota$   $\kappa\omicron\iota\iota$ .). NA 28 offers a more simple entry by first of all avoiding the abbreviations  $\kappa\omicron\iota\iota$ . and  $\pi$ . and then places the problematic  $\omicron\upsilon\iota\iota$  immediately after the first  $\omicron\upsilon$ . The apparatus reads:  $\omicron\upsilon$  ( $\omicron\upsilon\iota\iota$  F G)  $\kappa\omicron\iota\iota\mu\eta\theta\iota\varsigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$   $\omicron\upsilon$   $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\delta\epsilon$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A<sup>c</sup> F G. The next element of the apparatus —  $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ ,  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\pi$ .  $\delta\epsilon$  — is presented in NA 28's apparatus without a comma after  $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  and without the abbreviation ( $\pi$ .) for  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ . These are minor differences but both add to the improvement of the apparatus. Punctuation is often purely subjective but it can also indicate one's interpretation of the text. Elements in the apparatus should be presented without punctuation so as to allow the reader to make his own textual choices. Once again, the resolution of the abbreviation ( $\pi$ .) here invites simplification and fosters immediate comprehensibility.

While both NA 27 and 28 cite as witnesses for the Greek text B D<sup>2</sup>  $\Psi$  075. 0243. 1881  $\mathfrak{M}$  sy co; Hier<sup>mss</sup>, there are several manuscripts cited in the NA 28 apparatus that are missing from NA 27: K L P 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 2464. Manuscript 0243 (10th century) in the new apparatus has been re-evaluated and presented as a corrected text: 0243<sup>c</sup>.

## V

A new and very important addition to the *Novum Testamentum Graece* is the incorporation of readings from  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  (P.Oxy. 4968) into the critical apparatus of NA 28<sup>17</sup>. Sections of Acts 10-12 and 15-17 are found in  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  and, not infrequently, this papyrus has elements in common with *Codex Bezae* (D 05). Their respective variants are closely related. On occasion the text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  is longer or even sometimes shorter than the text of the Greek New Testament. The variants common to both  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  and *Codex Bezae* are not exclusively of a theological nature but have more to do with "narrative criticism"<sup>18</sup>, that is to say many verses have been reworked

<sup>17</sup> D.C. PARKER — S.R. PICKERING, "P.Oxy. 4968: Acta Apostolorum 10-12, 15-17", *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 74 (London 2009) 1-45.

<sup>18</sup> G. GÄBEL, "The Text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  (P.Oxy. 4968) and Its Relationship with the Text of Codex Bezae", *NT* 53 (2011) 107.

and extensively revised. There are not a few texts where variants found in  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  are transmitted by several witnesses. Sometimes they agree with *Codex Bezae* and sometimes they differ from it.

### Acts 11,2 (NA 27/28)

‘Ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, διεκρίνονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς’

Both NA 27 and 28 present the Greek text of Acts 11,2 as having the same witnesses:  $\mathfrak{P}^{45,74}$  & A B 81. Nestle–Aland 27 and 28 reproduce the Western text (D) of this verse in the critical apparatus: ‘ο μὲν οὖν Πέτρος δια ἰκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησε πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ προσφώνησας τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ ἐπιστηρίζας αὐτοὺς πολὺν λόγον ποιοῦμενος δια τῶν χωρῶν διδασκῶν αὐτοὺς· ὅς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπηγγείλειν αὐτοῖς τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ ἐκ περιτομῆς ἀδελφοὶ διεκρίνονται πρὸς αὐτὸν. NA 27 simply notes the witnesses D (p w sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> mae), while NA 28 includes  $\mathfrak{P}^{127 \text{ vid}}$  before D (p w sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> mae). For the variant Ἱεροσόλυμα, NA 27 listed the following witnesses: (D) E Ψ 33. 1739 ℣ lat. The new version, on the other hand, has a fuller set of witnesses for this variant:  $\mathfrak{P}^{127 \text{ vid}}$  D (cf') E L Ψ 33. 323. 614. 945. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739 ℣ lat. It is to be noted that D in parenthesis (D) in NA 27 to indicate that the witness shows only minor differences is presented as D (cf') in NA 28. That is, the reading Ἱεροσόλυμα in the text of the critical apparatus of NA 28 is the reading of *Codex Bezae*.

Here at Acts 11,2 (and elsewhere)  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  is not entirely legible and is referred to in the critical apparatus as  $\mathfrak{P}^{127 \text{ vid}}$ . The first part of the text of Acts 11,2, ο μὲν οὖν Πέτρος — πολὺν λόγον, attested in *Codex Bezae*, is lacunose in  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ . The transcription of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  by Parker and Pickering<sup>19</sup> provides us with the reconstruction of the next part of the text: [ποιοῦμενος] [δια τῶν χωρῶν] [διδασκῶν αὐτοὺς] [ὅς καὶ κατήντη] [σεν εἰς Ἱερ] [όσο] [λυμα καὶ ἀπη] [γείλειν αὐτοῖς] [τὴν χάριν τ] [οῦ] [θεοῦ οἱ ἐκ περιτ] [ομῆς οὐτε] [ς ἀδ] [ελ] [φοὶ διεκρίνο] [ν] [το πρὸς αὐτο] [ν].

The great similarity and broad agreement between D and  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  is most evident, and the inclusion of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  in NA 28's critical apparatus is an element that enriches the new edition. The emphasis of Acts 11,2 is on the teaching and proclamation of the apostles. The two texts, however, although they coincide often, are not identical. For example, οὐτε in the reconstructed text above is an addition in  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ . *Codex Bezae* does not contain this reading. On the other hand, an addition that both D and  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  transmit is that of ἀδελφοὶ. The Jews (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς) are indeed “brethren”, that is, they are believers in Jesus.

<sup>19</sup> PARKER – PICKERING, “P.Oxy. 4968: Acta Apostolorum 10-12, 15-17”, 18.

## Acts 12,8-9 (NA 27)

8 εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτόν· ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου. ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου καὶ ἀκολούθει μοι. 9 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἐστὶν τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· ἐδόκει δὲ ὄραμα βλέπειν.

## Acts 12,8-9 (NA 28)

8 εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος (πρὸς αὐτόν)· ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου. <sup>ε</sup> ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· <sup>α</sup> περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου καὶ <sup>τ</sup> ἀκολούθει μοι. 9 <sup>κ</sup> αὐτὸς ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι <sup>ι</sup> ἀληθὲς ἐστὶν τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· ἐδόκει δὲ ὄραμα βλέπειν.

NA 27's apparatus notes the following: 8 <sup>τ</sup>ε  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$   $\aleph$  A 33  $\mathfrak{M}$  | *txt* B D E  $\Psi$  36. 81\*. 453. 614. 945. 1175. 1739. *al* lat sy<sup>h</sup> 9 <sup>υ</sup>πο A H 104 *al* sy<sup>hmg</sup>. The apparatus to NA 28, on the other hand, is fuller due not only to the readings from  $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ , but also because of the witnesses, some of which are new, that had been consulted and re-evaluated. These variants at Acts 12,8-9 are typical for the Western text. For example, the witnesses for <sup>τ</sup>ε in verse 8 are more numerous in NA 28's apparatus: <sup>τ</sup>ε  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$   $\aleph$  A L 33. 81. 323. 1241. 1505  $\mathfrak{M}$ . The witnesses to the text of verse 8 have likewise been expanded: *txt* B D E  $\Psi$  453. 614. 945. 1175. 1739. 2818 lat sy<sup>h</sup>. What is new in NA 28's apparatus to verse 8 is the attestation of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  readings, some of which are singular variants: <sup>τ</sup>ω Περτω  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  | <sup>ε</sup>υποδηματα  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  and (d) | <sup>ε</sup>και  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  and Ephr Chr<sup>pt</sup> 20. The most obvious addition is that of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  and (mae), indicated by the critical sign <sup>τ</sup>: λαβομενος τον Περτον προηγαγεν εξω ειπων <sup>21</sup>. This is an example whereby the added information in a clear narrative allows the reader to understand immediately that the angel is leading Peter out of the prison. NA 28's apparatus to verse 9 not only slightly alters the witnesses for <sup>υ</sup>πο: A 104 sy<sup>hmg</sup>, but more importantly it adds the readings of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  and mae — ο δε Περτος ηκολουθει μη ειδως ει — where the Greek text of verse 9 reads: καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι.

## Acts 15,30 (NA 27)

Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες <sup>τ</sup> κατήλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ συναγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν.

<sup>20</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  omits ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ. This shorter, more concise text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{127\text{vid}}$  is in agreement with other manuscripts (0142, 617, 103) and versions (Ephr Chr<sup>pt</sup>), but not with D.

<sup>21</sup> PARKER – PICKERING, "P. Oxy. 4968: Acta Apostolorum 10-12, 15-17", 20: λαβο]μενος [τον Περτον] προ[ηγαγεν ε]ξω ειπων.



(NA 27)

ⱱ εν ημεραις ολιγαις D\* (I)

Acts 15,30 (NA 28)

Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες ⱱ κατήλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ συναγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν.

(NA 28)

ⱱ εν ημεραις ολιγαις (Ɀ<sup>127vid</sup>) D\* (I)

The apparatus to this verse in NA 27 indicates that the original text of *Codex Bezae*, as well as a 7th century Vetus Latina manuscript (with minor differences) from León, (I), read εν ημεραις ολιγαις. The NA 28 apparatus notes that, in addition to the witnesses D\* (I) already noted in NA 27, the important witness Ɀ<sup>127vid</sup> (with minor differences) also contains this reading. Parker and Pickering reconstruct the addition in Ɀ<sup>127vid</sup> as follows: [εν ο]λιγαις [δε ημε]ραις <sup>22</sup>. This is an example of how on occasion there is agreement between Ɀ<sup>127vid</sup> and D against all other Greek witnesses. A variant reading in Acts 15,30 noted in the apparatus of NA 28 is that of τα γραμματα, attested in Ɀ<sup>127vid</sup>, where the Greek NT text reads τὴν ἐπιστολήν <sup>23</sup>.

## VI

I have three suggestions for the next printing of Nestle–Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece*. The first is a seemingly minor point, namely that the editors of NA discontinue the convention of putting a word or a phrase in square brackets ([ ]) when the reading is problematic or not entirely convincing for textual critics. For example, at Matt 18,19 ([ἀμήν]) and Acts 16,1 ([καί]), the discussion in the critical apparatus should suffice to avert the reader that there is not complete consensus about the authenticity of the reading. As mentioned above, the presence of square brackets in classical texts usually indicates that the bracketed text has been deleted by the editor and is therefore not to be read. There is no need for the use of square brackets in the body of the text. Their presence not only confuses the reader, but renders the format of the text cumbersome.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 21: [τα γραμ]ματα.

The second suggestion is a plea that concerns the improper use of the word “Itala” in referring to the Vetus Latina. Note 12 on p. 68\* of the introduction reads as follows: “The Old Latin tradition is referred to below by synecdoche using the conventional term “Itala”. On the character and structure of the Latin tradition, cf. the publications of the Vetus-Latina Institute, Beuron”. Specialists in the field of the Latin Bible no longer use the infelicitous term “Itala”. The word was used *once* by Augustine to mean something entirely different. Eva Schulz-Flügel, a long-standing member of the Vetus Latina Institute, explains the problem in this way: “Ebenso wie ‘Afra’ nur eine Bezeichnung nach der geographischen Verbreitung ist, will der Name ‘Itala’ (Aug. *Doctr. Chr.* II 15) <sup>24</sup> nichts anderes bedeuten als die Textform, die Augustin in Italien schätzen lernte. Eine Bezeichnung aller Vetus Latina (VL) Formen mit ‘Itala’ ist unsachgemäß” <sup>25</sup>. I suggest that in the future this “conventional term” be discarded and that “VL” replace it.

My third suggestion concerns the addition of new material that could be easily integrated into the critical apparatus. The editors of NA 28, as noted above, have opted not to note conjectural readings in their new edition <sup>26</sup>, perhaps with good reason, but it is unfortunate that they have failed to mention new text-critical discoveries, which are not conjectures but important elements of the early manuscript evidence that could help scholars make text-critical judgments. This omission of text-critical symbols should be rectified in the next edition of Nestle–Aland. There is a consensus among textual critics and codicologists that text-critical signs can be dated to the time of the writing of *Codex Vaticanus*. R.J. Swanson <sup>27</sup> and T. Wasserman <sup>28</sup> cite all the attestations of distigmai and distigmeobelos in the biblical texts that they study. Important text-critical discoveries that Philip B. Payne and Paul Canart <sup>29</sup> have made in their careful

<sup>24</sup> The text of Augustine reads: “In ipsis autem interpretationibus, *Itala* ceteris praeferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae”.

<sup>25</sup> E. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, “Übersetzungen ins Lateinische”, *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft* (eds. H.D. BETZ u.a.) (Tübingen <sup>4</sup>1998-2007) 1492.

<sup>26</sup> NA 27 accepts interpolation as a conjecture at 1 Cor 14,34-35. The formulation is as follows: [— Straatman *cj*].

<sup>27</sup> R.J. SWANSON, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus* (Wheaton 2003-2005).

<sup>28</sup> T. WASERMAN, *The Epistle of Jude: Its text and transmission* (Stockholm 2006).

<sup>29</sup> P.B. PAYNE – P. CANART, “Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of *Codex Vaticanus*: Do They Mark the Location of Textual Variants?”, *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209)*, Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires (ed. P.

study of *Codex Vaticanus*'s use of distigmai (two horizontally-aligned dots that resemble umlauts, B") in the margin of the manuscript to mark the location of textual variants and the distigme-obelos symbol (distigme + bar, B"-) to identify the location of multi-word interpolations where there is a gap in the text<sup>30</sup> should be incorporated into the critical apparatus of Nestle–Aland. This convention is accepted by modern New Testament textual critics. Payne and Canart argue as follows: "Since there is always the possibility that a distigme in *Vaticanus* might signal a variant other than the ones known today, critical editions should explain this in their description of B". <...> The addition of B" would be appropriate, for instance, to add as part of the textual evidence for the inclusion of Ioh. 7,53–8,11 after Ioh. 7,52 and also as part of the textual evidence, along with *Codex Fuldensis* and 88\*, for the omission of I Cor. 14,34–35"<sup>31</sup>.

In the next edition of NA, one should include these two new entries (B" and B"-) as well as the letters TP (Transcriptional Probability) after B (03), presently on p. 59\* of the introduction. There are eight distigme-obelos symbols in *Codex Vaticanus* that identify the location of multi-word interpolations<sup>32</sup>. The distigme-obelos symbols are used in general

---

ANDRIST) (Lausanne 2009) 199–226. See especially Canart's study of the ink of the distigmai in *Codex Vaticanus*, whereby he concluded that the ink color of many of the 51 distigmai indicates that they were part of the original manuscript (203–209).

<sup>30</sup> NA 27 at Luke 14,11. Canard affirms that at this place in the text (between verses 11 and 12) we have the original ink color of *Codex Vaticanus*.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 216, with bibliography.

<sup>32</sup> P.B. Payne has generously supplied me with this valuable information from an unpublished paper about the 8 distigme-obelos found in *Codex Vaticanus*. Each distigme-obelos occurs at the exact location of a multi-word, widely recognized interpolation. The 8 distigme-obelos should alert the reader to the interpolations. The 8 interpolations, except for 1 Cor 14,34–35, which is printed in the body of the Greek text itself and marked by the critical signs ('...'), are found in the critical apparatus of Nestle–Aland 28 and its previous editions: Matt 13,51: λέγει αυτοις ο Ιησους ; Matt 18,11 (< Luke 19,10): ηλθεν γαρ ο υιος ανθρωπου ζητησαι και σωσαι το απολωλος ; Mark 5,40: ο δε Ιησους ; Luke 1,28 (< Luke 1,42): ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν ; Luke 14,24 (< Matt 22,14): πολλοι γαρ εισιν κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι ; Acts 2,47: εν τη εκκλησια. εν δε ταις ημεραις ταυταις ; Acts 6,10–11: δια το ελεγχεσθαι αυτους επ αυτου μετα πασης παρρησιας· μη δυναμενοι ουν αντοφθαλμειν τη αληθεια ; 1 Cor 14,34–35: αι γυναικες εν ταις εκκλησιαις σιγατωσαν· ου γαρ επιτρεπεται αυταις λαλειν, αλλ' υποτασσεσθωσαν, καθως και ο νομος λεγει. ει δε τι μαθειν θελουσιν, εν οικω τους ιδιους ανδρας επρωτατωσαν· αισχρον γαρ εστιν γυναικι λαλειν εν εκκλησια. It would suffice to include the symbol B"- in the critical apparatus as an important marker.

to mark spurious texts in Greek manuscripts and are more commonly found in the margins on Hexaplaric manuscripts to mark LXX interpolations added to the MT.

In the case of the *crux interpretum* at 1 Cor 14,34-35, one of the eight passages marked by a distigme-obelos symbol in *Codex Vaticanus*, it would be very simple to insert the text-critical symbol B<sup>-</sup> (distigme-obelos) in the apparatus at its exact location and thus include this important manuscript evidence to identify 1 Cor 14,34-35 as an interpolation. The apparatus could thus clearly demonstrate with manuscript evidence that 1 Cor 14,34-35 was not originally in the text of 1 Corinthians. Philip Payne has argued convincingly that the omission of these verses from 1 Cor by MS 88\* should be also included as a witness here. It is most likely that MS 88 was copied from a manuscript that did not contain these verses<sup>33</sup>. Another important witness for the omission of these two verses from 1 Corinthians is *Codex Fuldensis*<sup>34</sup>. The corrected text of this manuscript by Victor of Capua found in the bottom margin omits 1 Cor 14,34-35. Nestle–Aland 28 and the previous editions of the *Novum Testamentum Graece*, unfortunately, do not include readings from this 6th century Latin manuscript. This lacuna should be rectified in the next edition. Another witness for the absence of these verses from 1 Corinthians is Clement of Alexandria's *Paed.* 3:11 in light of *Strom.* 4.19<sup>35</sup>. Finally, if we adopt the theory of Transcriptional Probability, there can be no doubt that 1 Cor 14,34-35 is an interpolation. These two verses were probably written in the margin and were later copied into the text, most likely after v. 40. NA 27 and 28 concur in their apparatuses: 34/35 *vss* 34/35 *pon. p.* 40. A more thorough critical apparatus, however, could be constructed as follows: *om.* B<sup>-</sup> 88\* Fuldensis<sup>mg</sup> Cl TP.

\*

Every student of the Greek New Testament will find the 28th edition of Nestle–Aland a welcome addition to his library. The editors have produced

<sup>33</sup> P.B. PAYNE, "MS. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5", *NTS* 44 (1998) 152-158.

<sup>34</sup> B.M. METZGER – B.D. EHLMANN, *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (New York – Oxford 2005) 108: "Codex Fuldensis, now in the Landesbibliothek at Fulda, was written between A.D. 541 and 546 at Capua by order of Victor, the bishop of that see, and was corrected by him personally. It contains the whole New Testament, together with the apocryphal *Epistle to the Laodiceans*. The Gospels are arranged in a single, consecutive narrative, in imitation of Tatian's diatessaron. Its text, which is very good, is akin to that of codex Amiatinus". See also P.B. PAYNE, "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5", *NTS* 41 (1995) 240-262.

<sup>35</sup> P.B. PAYNE, *Man and Woman, One in Christ. An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 250-251.

an outstanding volume with some new readings, but most especially they have constructed a critical apparatus that is simplified and richer than those of previous editions. The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method, a meta-method, that argues for the state of the text that the manuscripts convey and does not make text-critical judgments on the basis of the authority of one manuscript over another, is very convincing, especially when the genealogical relationship of the witnesses, arranged in stemmata, is projected onto a large computer screen. The editors' work on the *Editio Critica Maior* will undoubtedly warrant the publication of yet another Nestle–Aland edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* as soon as the ECM of the *Acts of the Apostles* is completed. This reality underscores the fact that this new edition and those that will follow are actually in themselves part of the history of the transmission of the Greek New Testament because with each new edition the text continually undergoes changes. The text is not static but is constantly in motion. In the meantime, Nestle–Aland 28 will function as the most important instrument in academic teaching, research and scholarly exegesis of the New Testament, just as its previous editions have done during the past one hundred years.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00197 Rome

Anthony J. FORTE

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Annette SCHELLENBERG, *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes? Zum Gedanken einer Sonderstellung des Menschen im Alten Testament und in weiteren altorientalischen Quellen* (ATANT 101). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 2011. 474 p. 16,5 × 24. €64.80

In ihrer Zürcher Habilitationsschrift befasst sich S. zwar besonders intensiv mit den im Detail immer noch kontrovers beurteilten Bild-Gottes-Aussagen der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte, sie bezieht aber, indem sie die Fragestellung auf die auch auf andere Weise ausgedrückte Sonderstellung des Menschen hin ausweitet, Psalm 8 und Genesis 2–3 ein. Diese drei viel behandelten Texte analysiert sie in sorgfältigster Auseinandersetzung mit der umfangreichen Sekundärliteratur unter dem dreifachen Aspekt: Verhältnis Mensch – Gott, Mensch – Tier, Mensch – Mensch noch einmal neu (Kap. 1–4). So gewinnt sie eine breite Palette von Gesichtspunkten und Formulierungsmustern. Entsprechend weit greift sie, ebenfalls unter diesem dreifachen Aspekt, im Vergleich mit der mesopotamischen und ägyptischen Literatur aus (Kap. 5). Als Gegenprobe stellt sie solche atl. und aor. Texte dagegen, die einerseits Tiere als dem Menschen überlegen oder in ihrer Geschöpflichkeit gleichrangig darstellen oder andererseits innerhalb der Gesamtmenschheit dem König, dem Weisen oder dem eigenen Volk eine Sonderstellung zuweisen (Kap. 6). Auf dem Hintergrund dieser Ergebnisse kehrt sie im kurzen letzten Kapitel noch einmal zur Priesterschrift zurück, die sie unter dem Aspekt der prinzipiellen Gleichheit aller Menschen innerhalb ihrer Sonderstellung gegenüber Gott und Tieren als im Alten Orient außergewöhnlich charakterisiert, und untersucht unter den Termini “Inklusivismus” und “Exklusivismus”, inwieweit die Priesterschrift im Fortgang nach der Urgeschichte die prinzipielle Gleichheit aller Israeliten und, trotz überwiegender Sonderstellung Israels, die aller Menschen in Ansätzen positiv andeutet oder wenigstens durch nicht-ausschließende Wendungen offenhält. Insgesamt enthält diese materialreiche, stets argumentative und sehr anregende, gelegentlich auch provozierende Habilitationsschrift viele neue Einsichten. Sie fördert nicht nur die innerexegetische Diskussion, sondern verdient Beachtung auch in den anderen theologischen Disziplinen.

Im Zentrum der Arbeit steht die Bild-Gottes-Aussage der P.S. legt eine hoch komplexe These vor, die in steile theologische Thesen mündet: Die

Metapher legt in Gen 1 das besondere Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott primär auf seine Folgen für sein Verhältnis der Macht und der Verantwortung zu den Tieren aus; für sie ist er zum Stellvertreter Gottes bestellt. Nur das Dass, nicht das Wie der Herrschaft wird ausgesagt, dennoch wird sie als Aufrechterhaltung von Ordnung, Recht und Frieden charakterisiert. Gen 5 versteht die Metapher, wie bereits in Gen 1 angelegt, als Gestaltähnlichkeit im Sinn einer vererbbaaren Familienähnlichkeit "im Aussehen... und im Wesen" (122), die aber aus einem adoptionsvergleichbaren Verhältnis resultiert. P präzisiert diese brisante Bestimmung allerdings nicht. "Das Schweigen ist Teil der Botschaft" (122). In Genesis 9 haben sich auf Grund des völligen Versagens des Menschen Stellvertretung Gottes und Herrschaftsauftrag erledigt und bezieht sich die Metapher nur noch auf die dennoch bleibende Würde und Vorrangstellung des Menschen. Gott wird nun die Sorge für Ordnung, Recht und Frieden ("wieder" 68) selbst übernehmen.

Die Bild-Gottes-Aussage überträgt, zumal der König in Israel nicht als Bild Gottes bezeichnet wird, nicht die vor allem aus Ägypten vertrauten Königsepitheta auf alle Menschen, sie und vielleicht auch die wenigen assyrischen Belege waren P wohl gar nicht bekannt, sondern sie erwächst allein aus der Analogie zu Kultbildern von Göttern und ist vielleicht von P aus Eigenem ohne Anregung durch altorientalische Vorbilder gebildet worden. Dennoch kann man wegen des Herrschaftsauftrags von Royalisierung des Menschen sprechen. Nach Ausweis von Genesis 9 wird der Mensch, der, den "Wunsch/Befehl Gottes" (73) "nicht erfüllen konnte oder wollte", "trotz seiner Natur" Bild Gottes genannt. Er ist Bild Gottes "nicht aufgrund seiner Qualitäten oder Aufgaben, sondern weil Gott ihn als dieses Bild erachtet. Darum kann die Bild-Gottes-Prädikation in 9,6 wiederholt werden, obwohl zu diesem Zeitpunkt Gott wie Leser wissen, dass der Mensch Gott nicht wirklich repräsentiert" (123-124).

S. betont zu Recht als Ergebnis der jüngeren Diskussion, dass eine scharfe Trennung zwischen Funktion und Wesen der priesterschriftlichen Konzeption der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit nicht entspricht. Aber dass S. nun in Schöpfungskontext mit radikaler Worttheologie und unter Verweis auf die "paulinisch-lutherische" Rechtfertigungslehre (124) einen Hiat zwischen der Natur des Menschen, der dem "Zuspruch/Anspruch" (394) Gottes mangels fehlender Qualitäten womöglich von Anfang an gar nicht gerecht werden "konnte", einerseits und der dennoch erhalten bleibenden Zuschreibung der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit "trotz seiner Natur" andererseits behauptet, will als Ausdeutung priesterschriftlicher Theologie noch weniger einleuchten.

Folgende für S.s komplexes Argument grundlegenden Elemente erscheinen diskussionswürdig: (1) Sie rückt die Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit vom Herrschaftsanspruch möglichst weit ab. Entsprechend wertet sie die Abfolge Kohortativ – w=Präfixkonjugation in Gen 1,26 nicht als finale Ver-



knüpfung, sondern übersetzt koordinierend: “Und sie sollen herrschen” (30). (2) Obwohl der Herrschaftsauftrag in Gen 1,28 gemäß der Eröffnung des Verses Teil des Segens ist, versteht sie ihn im Gegensatz zum Mehrungsauftrag nicht als seinsmäßige Befähigung, sondern als womöglich von vornherein die Natur des Menschen überfordernden Zuspruch/Anspruch. (3) In Gen 9,6 deutet sie das *Beth* als *Beth pretii* (“um des Menschen willen”), nicht als *Beth instrumenti*. Nur unter dieser Voraussetzung kann sie folgern, dass Gott nun selbst die Verantwortung für Ordnung und Frieden in seiner Schöpfung (mit welchem Ergebnis?) übernimmt. (4) Eine zentrale Rolle spielt das *argumentum e silentio*: Weil das Verb “herrschen” in 9,1-7 nicht mehr auftaucht, interpretiert sie die zum Segen Gen 1,28 (Befähigung, sich zu mehren und die Erde zu erfüllen – Auftrag, über die Tiere zu herrschen) parallele Segensabfolge 9,1-3 (Befähigung, sich zu mehren und die Erde zu füllen – Auslieferung der Tiere an den Menschen und Tötungserlaubnis zu Nahrungszwecken [in Abänderung der reinen Pflanzennahrung nach Gen 1,29]) nicht als mindernde bzw. realistischere Korrektur des Herrschaftsauftrags, sondern als Konsequenz der gänzlichen Aufhebung des Herrschaftsauftrags infolge des Versagens des Menschen, das zur Sintflut führte. Für den nachsintflutlichen Menschen gilt, “dass der Mensch den Tieren gegenüber an kein ‚Amtsethos‘ mehr gebunden ist, andererseits aber auch, dass er im Gott-Tier-Verhältnis keine Mittlerrolle mehr spielt” (68). Andernorts wendet sie das *argumentum e silentio* nicht so resolut an: Während der Segen in Genesis 1 dem männlich und weiblich realisierten Menschen gilt, segnet Gott in Gen 9,1 nur Noach und seine Söhne; in diesem Fall will S. zwar nicht ganz ausschließen, dass hierdurch eine Verschlechterung des Mann-Frau Verhältnisses angezeigt wird, aber es scheint ihr doch eher “wohl ein unbewusster Niederschlag der patriarchalischen Weltsicht des P-Verfassers” zu sein (134). (5) Der Versuch, dem priester-schriftlichen Autor die Kenntnis der sich in Bild-Gottes-Aussagen niederschlagenden altorientalischen Königsideologie abzusprechen, fordert eine breitere Untersuchung darüber, in welchem Umfang dieser Autor altorientalische Konzeptionen (kritisch) aufnimmt bzw. in seiner priesterlichen Lehrtradition vorfindet.

Zu Psalm 8 betont S. das Nebeneinander der universalen Perspektive bezüglich des Namens JHWHs und einer eingeschränkten Perspektive bezüglich der sprechenden “Wir”, die sich als JHWH-Gemeinde charakterisieren (“JHWH, unser Herrscher”; beides in 8,2+10); außerdem bleibt offen, ob die Aussagen über “den Menschen” auch die in 8,3 genannten Widersacher und Feinde einbeziehen. Mit Gen 1 verbindet die Tatsache, dass es um das “Dass”, nicht um das “Wie” der Ähnlichkeit zwischen Gott und Mensch geht. “Was das ‘Wenige’ ist, das ihm dazu noch fehlt, wird nicht ausgeführt”. Infolgedessen wird “auch offengelassen..., was das viele ist, das den Menschen so nahe an Gott heranrückt” (166-167). Am Verhältnis Mensch-Tier besteht in Psalm 8 über die Tatsache der herrschaftlichen Stellung des Menschen hinaus kein Interesse.

Im Gegensatz zu Psalm 8 wird Genesis 2–3 seltener mit der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte verglichen. S. erklärt sie für im Wesentlichen literarisch einheitlich und eher älter als P, wohl vorexilisch; P dürfte den Text gekannt haben, auch wenn Sicherheit nicht zu erlangen ist. Das Mensch-Tier-Verhältnis wird zwar im Sinn der Überordnung des Menschen geklärt, abgesehen vom Benennungsauftrag bleibt aber offen, worin seine Sonderstellung besteht. Die Gottähnlichkeit im Wissen um Gut und Böse, die den Menschen „wesenhaft (substantiell) mit Gott verbindet“ (213), aber in der Folge zugleich von Gott distanziert, wird ebenfalls nicht weiter entfaltet und wirkt sich auf das Verhältnis Mensch-Tier nicht aus. In der Benennung der Frau durch den Mann deutet der Verfasser, ohne es zu beabsichtigen, an, dass die post-paradiesisch verhängte Herrschaft des Mannes über die Frau schon im Paradies angelegt ist. Diese Herrschaft wird weder in ihrer Eigenart geklärt noch zur Sonderstellung des Menschen in Beziehung gesetzt. Die Vorstellung von einem königlichen ersten Menschen gehörte zwar zu den Traditionsvorgaben, findet aber in der Paradieserzählung kein Interesse.

In ihrem breiten Vergleich mit außeraltestamentlichen altorientalischen Texten unterscheidet S. die überaus häufigen „impliziten“ Zeugen einer Sonderstellung des Menschen, sei es gegenüber den Tieren, sei es gegenüber den Göttern, von den wenigen „(semi-)expliziten“ Zeugen. Auch diese sprechen zwar allgemein von „dem Menschen“, es fehlen aber im Gegensatz zur Priesterschrift eindeutige Hinweise, „dass die allgemeinen Aussagen auch tatsächlich universal gemeint sind, während häufiger von der Sonderstellung von Königen, Weisen oder des eigenen Volkes die Rede ist“ (300).

Insofern billigt S. der Priesterschrift, die in der Urgeschichte explizit von der Sonderstellung der Menschheit vor allen Differenzierungen in Völker oder Ämter spricht, eine Sonderstellung zu. Auf der Suche nach Anzeichen eines entsprechenden „Inklusivismus“ im Fortgang der Priesterschrift trotz eindeutiger Betonung der Sonderstellung Israels verweist S. vor allem auf die Offenheit der Priesterschrift gegenüber Fremden, die dauerhaft in Israel leben und sich deren Lebensweise anpassen. Die Gefahr der Überinterpretation ist freilich nicht zu übersehen. In Genesis 17 erhält Abraham die den Schöpfungssegens variierende Mehrungszusage als Bundesverheißung (17,1-6). In 17,7-9 hingegen verheißt JHWH ihm einen Bund mit ihm und „seinem Samen nach ihm“. Da Abraham an der Zusage eines leiblichen Sohnes Isaak aus Sara zweifelt und den einzigen bisher existierenden Sohn Ismael in das Spiel bringt, verfügt JHWH in 17,19-21, er werde nur mit Isaak den Bund für „seinen Samen nach ihm“ schließen, Ismael freilich auch segnen, und er schließt mit der nochmaligen Versicherung, seinen Bund schließe er nur mit Isaak. Man sollte meinen, das könne gar nicht eindeutiger formuliert werden. So muss folgendes Urteil irritieren, weil es die Aussage dieses zentralen Kapitels

der Priesterschrift auf den Kopf stellt: So sehr JHWH bei seinem Bundesschluss mit Abraham den noch ungeborenen Isaak favorisiert, gehören nach Genesis 17 auch Ismael und alle anderen Nachkommen Abrahams zum Bund" (375). Als Nachweis der inklusiven Tendenz genügt, dass Ismael die variierte Form des nach der Sintflut wiederholten Schöpfungsegens in 17,20 erhält.

S. stellt das Theologumenon der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit des Menschen in weite Fragehorizonte, durch die Gegenproben bringt sie für das AT wie für den Alten Orient wichtige neue Akzente. Ihrer Habilitationsschrift ist eine intensive Auseinandersetzung zu wünschen.

Mallestraße, 24  
D-72072 Tübingen

Walter GROSS

Kay WEISSFLOG, *Zeichen und Sinnbilder*. Die Kinder der Propheten Jesaja und Hosea (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 36). Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2011. 577 p. 16,5 × 23,5

This monograph is the author's doctoral dissertation accepted by the theology faculty of Universität Leipzig in 2009. As the title of the book suggests, this study analyzes the literary figuration and function of the children of the two prophets, Isaiah and Hosea, as well as the possible historical backgrounds and redactional developments in both texts. Accordingly, the primary focus lies on Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3, where these children play significant roles (cf. Isa 8,18) with regard to the fate of Israel and Judah vis-à-vis their symbolic, sociopolitical, and tradition-historical relationship with YHWH.

After a brief review of scholarship and introduction, Weißflog offers careful translations and text-critical examinations. The subsequent verse-by-verse close readings of each text take up the bulk of this study, each concluding with the summary analyses of Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3 on both synchronic and diachronic levels. What then follows might be the most important contribution, as Weißflog delineates the concepts of the children in Isaiah and Hosea in light of the pertinent ancient Near Eastern contexts and the tradition-historical progresses of the redactional layers. Equally innovatively, Weißflog further expounds the similarities and differences of the two texts, both reconceiving the unique meanings and functions of the children's names and exploring the literary interrelationship of the two compatible traditions.

In the recap of the text analysis on Isaiah 7–8, Weißflog presents insightful observations on the synchronic and diachronic levels. With regard to the synchronic dimension, amid the unified whole, Weißflog identifies two distinct genres: a foreign report, including the confrontation with Ahaz

and the Davidic house (ch. 7), and an autobiographical report, which addresses the people as a whole (ch. 8). He then traces the tension and development of key themes in relation to the reciprocal juxtaposition of salvation and judgment oracles concerning Judah throughout these two chapters. Accordingly, the name *Shear-jashub* (7,3) denotes not only the demise of northern Israel and Aram (7,4-9) but also the resultant threat upon Judah by the expansion of the Assyrian invasion (7,14-25). At the same time, this name, along with *Immanuel* (7,14; 8,8.10), can allude to the positive escape of a few remnants of Judah. Such a tension between negative and positive meanings applies to the name *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (8,1) as well.

Pertaining to the diachronic aspect, Weißflog critiques the reductionist tendency to consider the prophet exclusively as either judgmental or salvific. Such a tendency often leads to an incompatible approach. As it has been conventionally considered, either judgment oracles are preexilic and salvation oracles are exilic/postexilic; or, according to the recent proposals in light of the Neo-Assyrian documents of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (7th century BCE), salvation oracles are original and thus judgment oracles were only retrospectively inserted into the preexilic salvific texts through the theological reflection of the exilic/postexilic time. Consequently, Weißflog proposes a criterion of the multi-step redactional process, rather than a linear one. For example, the names *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* originally and primarily may have functioned to underscore the negative warnings on the fate of southern Judah. It thus seems unlikely that the original notion of *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* contained the calamity announcements on northern Israel and Aram and salvific messages for southern Judah. Similarly, *Shear-jashub*, denoting the scarcity of population after the destruction and characteristically targeting northern Israel and Aram, enemies of Judah (Isa 7,4-9), may have originally denoted the warning of the Assyrian threat reaching southern Judah (8,6-8, 12-15). Such an original announcement of doom on the lack of faith in Ahaz and the royal house was then juxtaposed with the pronouncement of deliverance through the Immanuel texts, owing to the events of 701 BCE.

In summarizing the text-analysis on Hosea 1-3, Weißflog interprets the marriage metaphor in light of the ancient Near Eastern legal covenant stipulation. As a main thesis regarding the thematic threads in the synchronic and diachronic levels, Weißflog retrieves two distinct but interrelated levels in the analysis of the text: (1) the (auto)biographical-individual level and (2) the historical-theological-collective level. This interpretive axiom of two levels is taken to examine the thematic uniqueness and redactional development of Hosea 1-3, which consists of six direct speeches (1,2-3; 1,4-5; 1,6-7; 1,9-2,25; 3,1-2; 3,3-5).

Hos 2,4-15 is the core of Hosea 1-3 and the original corpus in the redactional development. This section depicts the people's lack of exclu-

sive covenant fidelity to YHWH through the adultery of the wife and mother against the husband, along with the conditional announcement of disaster (placed after the anticipatory description of future salvific events of 1,1-9 and 2,1-3).

Next, Hosea 1 was written as a commentary on Hos 2,4-15. For example, Hos 1,2-3 is placed as the introduction to the two different levels, both associated with the motif of “harlotry”: the biographical-individual level of Hosea’s relationship with a wife and her children; the historical-theological-collective level of the relationship between YHWH and Israel.

The third redactional segments are Hos 2,1-3 [Eng. 1,10-2,1] and Hos 2,16-25 [Eng. 2,14-23], thereby constructing Hosea 2 in a pattern of positive (2,1-3), negative (2,4-15), and positive (2,16-25) oracles. On one side, 2,1-3 contains a proleptic view of future salvation for Israel and Judah. As a response to 1,2-9, which has primary concern over northern Israel, here the concern for the “sons of [northern] Israel” is conjoined with the “sons of Judah” (2,2) toward the theme of the reunification after the exile, discernible in words such as “the sons of the living El” (2,1) and “(my) people” (2,3). On the other side, 2,16-25 pronounces the ultimate restoration of the marriage with positive outcomes. Altogether, Hosea 2 forms a thesis concept through the statement on *(Lo) ammi*, projecting the future dispensation (2,1-3), loss (2,4-15), and recovery (2,16-25).

The final redactional layer is Hos 3,1-5. Unlike 1,2-2,25, Hosea 3 is described in the autobiographical perspective and lacks the distinction between the wife and the children. Alongside this, various shifts between Hosea 1-2 and Hosea 3 evidence the plausibility that Hosea 3 was either a redactional sequel to Hosea 1-2 or a parallel-account to Hosea 1 from another source.

In the next major section, with regard to the concepts of Isaiah, Weißflog delineates three distinct tradition-historical processes in Isaiah 7-8. The first, and the earliest, stage contains the warnings directed to Judah only (e.g., 7,3; 8,3). Weißflog argues that the two “iconic signs” in the names, *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, point to the same event of the military threat to Judah, in terms of the quantitative (only a few remnants) and qualitative (plundering the war spoils) aspects respectively around the Syro-Ephraimite coalition. The second stage points to the explicit announcement of punishment upon Aram and northern Israel (e.g., 7,16; 8,4), of the years 732 BCE and 722 BCE respectively, during the campaigns of Neo-Assyria. Consequently, together with the name *Immanuel* (7,14), the two names, whose original meaning alluded to the judgment on Judah, now construe a salvific perspective for Judah. The third stage encompasses the reversed positive connotation on the names of the two sons of Isaiah (e.g., 7,21-22; 8,9-10). In light of the tradition-historical event and theological interpretation of the year 701 BCE, both names are thus transformed from the negative to the positive aspect alongside Zion theology.

With regard to the concepts of Hosea, Weißflog expounds a further synthesis as well; i.e., a tradition-historical reconstruction of the multi-stage development of the key layers. Thus, 2,4-15, as the earliest core of the composition of Hosea 1-3, primarily focuses on the town of Samaria, with the roles of the “wife” and the “sons” on a biographical-individual level. Next, with 1,2 as a hinge, 1,3-9 expands the realm to the political-territorial level of northern Israel. Hos 2,1-3 then interrupts the original connection between 1,2-9 and 2,4-15 with the salvific motif of the future restoration of both Israel and Judah. Afterwards, 2,16-25 extends the restoration of the relationship toward unity onto the ethnic-religious level. Finally, 3,1-5 recapitulates the imagery of Israel as the “wife” of YHWH, but the “sons of Israel” refer back to the former northern Israel of Samaria, as the wayward wife who shall return to YHWH and the Davidic monarchy of Jerusalem.

The final section compares the two relevant books. Both Isaiah 7-8 and Hosea 1-3 illustrate the prophets’ children as an overarching theme, along with the unique functions of their names. Yet, whereas Isaiah 7-8 tends to be closely associated with the historical-political issues, Hosea 1-3 is more oriented toward historical-theological underpinnings. Moreover, with regard to the relationship between the two books, beyond the common functions of the children’s names and the customary expressions in Isa 8,3 and Hos 1,3.6.9, Weißflog asks whether it is feasible to consider an intentional literary connection between these two corpora. His answer is yes, asserting that the discourse of Hosea 1-3 fits smoothly with the structure of Isaiah 7-8. Elucidating considerable correlations, Weißflog further posits that even the names Isaiah and Hosea (which share a verbal root) may tradition-historically allude to one and the same prophet, hinting that the origins of the twelve minor prophets were not independent of those of the three major prophets.

This volume undoubtedly provides significant contributions. It judiciously delineates the pivotal functions and implications of the names of the children of the prophets as essential overtures in both books. It admirably links the meticulous investigations on the selected texts with thematic syntheses and redactional reconstructions. The follow-up explications on the tradition-historical layers reveal important insights and potential for further study. Overall, this work is creative, critical, and convincing.

However, even this voluminous monograph engenders a few questions. First of all, even though there have not been many extensive studies on the prophets’ children in Isaiah and Hosea, it is strange that the author reviews only five, albeit deserving, works (G. Fohrer, B. Lang, S. Amsler, R. Hutton, and H. Liss). Considering that the topic covers two books, Isaiah and Hosea, with regard to the “Isaiah memoir” as well as the “husband-wife” and “parent-child” metaphors, one wonders whether other pertinent works should have been consulted more carefully, particularly those written in English (e.g.,



R. Clements, K. Darr, S. Moughtin-Mumby, J. Roberts, and H. Williamson). Similarly, especially as this study is predominantly diachronic in its approach, many recent scholarly works may need closer attention (e.g., J. Dearman, A. Macintosh, J. Nogalski, P. Redditt, A. Scharf, etc.). Furthermore, as one of the most notable contributions of this study, Weißflog proposes the likelihood of the compositional and/or intertextual correlations between Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3. It is regrettable that such an observation takes up only a small segment of discussion. As a result, this cogent study reads like a collection of two separate works, on Isaiah and Hosea, without substantial interrelations. Interested readers would hope that more detailed analyses on both texts be available, both synchronically and diachronically.

This work clearly demonstrates a study of redactional analysis par excellence. It is replete with cutting-edge insights and innovative propositions. It certainly is a welcome contribution to the current prophetic literature scholarship.

Methodist Theological School in Ohio  
3081 Columbus Pike  
Delaware, Ohio 43015  
USA

Hyun Chul Paul KIM

Donna Lee PETTER, *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments* (OBO 246). Fribourg, Academic Press – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. xv-198 p. 15,5 × 23. SFr 58

This slightly revised dissertation, begun under the guidance of Brian Peckham at the University of Toronto and completed under Glen Taylor's supervision after Peckham's death, joins recent attempts to explain the unique literary coherence of the book of Ezekiel. Taking her cue from the present reviewer's contention that the book's design cannot be explained solely with reference to Israelite and Judean prophetic genres, Petter suggests that the Mesopotamian City Lament genre (MCL) "likely" explains a good many of the unusual and heretofore unexplained features of the Book of Ezekiel, including the prophet's muteness and "multifaceted portrayal," the book's "cohesion," the placement of the Oracles against the Nations, and, finally, its program of restoration (5).

Petter develops her argument in two parts. In the first two chapters, Petter first describes the basic features of the MCL, and then reports on recent scholarly work that has traced the influence of the MCL on Israelite and Judean literary traditions, including the prophetic literature. In the remainder of the book, Petter seeks to identify lament elements in the persona of Ezekiel, YHWH's divine anger and abandonment of Jerusalem, sin and judgment, and restoration. A concluding chapter presents a coherent



reading of Ezekiel on the basis of her positing the presence of lament elements in Ezekiel.

In the chapter devoted to the Mesopotamian literature, Petter catalogues extant city laments, describes their probable cultic settings, traces the continuation of the MCL tradition into the first millennium by way of the *balag* and *eršemma* lament, and enumerates and describes nine specific features that can be said to constitute the genre. Of particular interest for Petter's analysis of Ezekiel is the last element, the restoration of the city. Not all MCLs develop this feature in any great detail, but Petter finds it particularly instructive that nearly half of the Nippur Lament (NL) is devoted to the city's restoration (29-31), which is explicitly presented as a reversal of the earlier destruction (30).

Unfortunately, it is the very uniqueness of the Nippur Lament that proves problematic. None of the other city laments develop the theme of restoration; and the theme is absent from the *balag* and *eršemma* laments which actually do survive into the first millennium. The absence of the restoration theme from first millennium materials is, in this reviewer's opinion, fatal for Petter's argument, which revolves around the persistence of a *genre* of lament tradition containing these nine elements. Yet this difficulty is obscured by the manner in which Petter outlines the nine characteristics of the lament genre. Moreover, if this element is unique to the Nippur Lament, one wonders how the theme of restoration can be said to be a generic element at all. Yet if I understand Petter correctly, only the Nippur Lament develops the theme of restoration as a *literary* element. Petter's inclusion of the theme of restoration as one of the elements of the MCL lasting into the first millennium is therefore somewhat disingenuous (29-32).

Other aspects of her treatment of genre are similarly problematic. For one thing, the list of features which are said to indicate the presence of the lament genre are not well suited to the argument she must put forward in order to demonstrate the presence of lament features in Ezekiel. Petter credits F. W. Dobbs Allsopp's ground-breaking study of Lamentations for this classification of the lament genre, but it must also be said that she adopts it somewhat uncritically and seeks to employ it to solve problems it was not designed to address. Particularly problematic is her lack of attention to other possible explanations for similar motifs. To take one example, the motif of divine abandonment. This motif is one of the nine characteristic features of the MCL tradition, but it is not unique to the lament tradition and can be found in other Mesopotamian genres, at least two of which have been proposed as parallels for Ezekiel (i.e., the Erra Epic, by Daniel Bodi, and Esarhaddon's Babylonian inscription, by the present reviewer). Given the prevailing mood of the Book of Ezekiel, which is anything but lament, Petter's argument would have been considerably stronger if she had provided a generic model for determining just how lament made its appearance in Ezekiel.

Such a theoretical proposal would have considerably strengthened what is by far the most intriguing proposal in the book: Petter's contention that many of the elements in Ezekiel's persona can be effectively interpreted in light of the MCL's motif of the weeping goddess. Through a close reading of the call narrative as well as an examination of the connections between what is known of mourning rites and Ezekiel's physical gestures, Petter suggests that by swallowing the scroll, Ezekiel takes on the role of the weeping goddess. Two points are especially interesting, if not finally persuasive. First, (following the present reviewer) Petter points out that that content of the scroll is not judgment but mourning and lament, and that in ingesting the scroll, Ezekiel *becomes* a mourner. The presence of laments on the scroll suggests, then, to Petter, that lament is a kind of submerged genre throughout the book. Second, Petter draws attention to the manner in which Ezekiel *becomes* the city of Jerusalem as he enacts the siege of Jerusalem in the symbolic acts of chapters 4–5. Here again, in identifying with the city of Jerusalem, the prophet takes on the role of the weeping goddess. Other previously unexplained features of the book, including the prophet's muteness, thus can be explained as the persistence of mourning as a "subgenre" in the book.

Yet Petter never adequately explains what a "subgenre" or "submerged genre" is. Here is where less dependence on Dobbs-Allsopp's proposal and a more rigorous development of a method that would allow her to trace the interaction of genres would have been desirable. There is abundant evidence in Ezekiel that exiles come to the prophet to protest the deity's actions. Some of these episodes, in particular chapters 16 and 20, can be construed as a divine refusal to hear human protest and could effectively be interpreted to show just how the mood of lament becomes submerged in an otherwise profoundly angry book. Rather than take up this challenge, Petter resorts to a somewhat facile attempt to demonstrate that such motifs as divine anger and sin and judgment "could" be interpreted in light of the MCL genre.

Despite these serious problems in her argument, Petter's proposal is inviting, not least because it encourages a more modulated and nuanced reading of the emotional tenor of Ezekiel, if not all of the prophetic books. For much of the past century, form critical assessments of the prophetic adaptation of nonprophetic genres, especially those associated with mourning, have assumed that such appropriations can only have been intended as a mockery of the victims. This reviewer suspects that such readings are a reflex of latent Christian supersessionism, an assumption that Israelite and Judean national religion could have had no common human feeling for the destruction of human beings, enemy or otherwise. Petter is to be commended for inviting us to hear the complex tenor of these nonprophetic, submerged genres. Mourning is mourning, and it has a way of being voiced whether we hear it or not. Not to heed the nuances Petter

discerns would be to remain tone deaf to prophetic testimony to the passing of an era.

As inviting as her proposal is, however, it is not entirely persuasive. As interesting as it is, Petter's suggestion that Ezekiel is like the weeping goddess simply fails to convince. It is an interesting proposal, not least because it invites a consideration of the possibility of inverted gender roles. Unfortunately, the Book of Ezekiel itself provides other, more obvious explanations for Ezekiel's various roles. Within the call narrative itself, for example, Ezekiel is decidedly not appointed to function as a mourner. Quite in contrast with the weeping goddess who mourns the destruction of her city at the hand of a capricious deity, Ezekiel must conform his message and actions to the will of the Destroyer. And, while Petter is quite right to see a submerged tension between the destructive acts of YHWH and his appointment of Ezekiel as a sentinel to keep watch over those destined for destruction, the book makes it quite clear that the role of sentinel is form-critically at home in the context of war (cf. 33,1-10), not a lament tradition of either Mesopotamian or Judean stripe. In other words, even if Ezekiel is like the weeping goddess, he most decidedly would not be recognized as such by those who read his book.

St. Olaf College  
Northfield, MN 55057  
USA

M.S. ODELL

Andrew T. GLICKSMAN, *Wisdom of Solomon 10. A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 9). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2011. xiv-243 p. 16 × 23,5. €99,95

Voici la première monographie publiée sur ce chapitre. Rien qu'à ce titre, elle mérite attention. Le propos de G. est principalement de déterminer le genre littéraire (ch. 4) et la méthode herméneutique (ch. 6) de Sg 10,1–11,1. Entre ces deux chapitres, il propose une exégèse de ce texte (ch. 5) et, avant d'aborder la question du genre littéraire, il offre une étude consacrée à la structure littéraire du livre et du texte retenu, ainsi qu'à cette autre question: s'agit-il de prose rythmique ou de poésie? (ch. 3). Un chapitre préliminaire fait le point sur les problèmes généraux concernant le livre (ch. 2).

Ce chapitre préliminaire rappelle l'état de la recherche. Ces pages (6-31) montrent simplement que G. est au courant de cette recherche. Je note en particulier qu'il maintient la thèse courante aujourd'hui de l'unité de composition du livre (11); ma question sera, en fin de compte, de savoir comment il la comprend ou, plus exactement, comment, à ses yeux, Sg

11–19 apporte du sens à Sg 1–11; sur ce point, le silence de G. m'étonne. Je relève aussi quelques détails. Il tient encore qu'en Sg 8,19, il est question de la préexistence de l'âme (10, n.18; 13, n. 26; 165: "possible"; cf., par contre, mon étude dans *La Sagesse de Salomon*. The Wisdom of Solomon [AnBib 189; Rome 2011] 346-353). Pourquoi citer en latin (et sans l'interrogatif *cur*) le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josèphe (16, n. 36)? G. date Sg entre 30 av. J.-C. et 41 ap. J.-C. (24 et 30): ce n'est pas faux du tout, mais en Sg 6,3, le mot κράτησις est proprement augustéen; on le sait depuis G. Scarpat (1967) et G. n'en tient pas compte (24-25): cf. mon analyse dans *La Sagesse de Salomon*, 124-129. À la p. 25, n. 71, on pourra ajouter l'article de D. Volgger, "Die Adressaten Weisheitbüches", *Bib* 82 (2001) 153-177. Enfin, G. considère que manque l'évidence pour dire que Sg s'adresse à la jeunesse juive hellénisée — position de J.M. Reese, comme il le note — mais alors pourquoi Sg 7,1-22a et 8,2-21 évoquent-ils la jeunesse de Salomon? Il me semble que, dans ce chapitre préliminaire, G. aurait pu s'attacher davantage aux travaux récents.

Le chapitre 3 (32-63) entre vraiment dans la problématique de Sg 10. Il s'agit tout d'abord de présenter le texte de Sg 10,1–11,1, de le traduire, puis de le situer à l'intérieur de la structure littéraire du livre et d'en proposer la structure propre (32-38). Pour le texte grec de Sg 10,1–11,1, G. suit celui de J. Ziegler (1962, <sup>2</sup>1980), dont il reprend certaines notes de critique textuelle; pourtant, dans sa présentation du texte grec et de sa traduction, il distingue déjà cinq strophes (34-38), qu'il ne justifiera qu'à la fin du chapitre (56-60). Je note en passant que ce n'est pas Jérôme qui a constitué la Vulgate (33). Quant à la structure de l'ensemble de Sg, G. suit la proposition de A.G. Wright (1967) qui divise le livre en deux parties : Sg 1,1–11,1 et 11,1–19,22: je ne connais aucun commentateur important de Sg qui ait repris récemment cette division bipartite, d'autant qu'à la suite de Reese (1965), Wright reconnaissait une structure concentrique en Sg 1–6 et 7–8, ce que G. mentionne simplement sans y insister (40). Le point en discussion concerne en fait les limites de Sg 10,1–11,1 (43-47); ici G. ne suit pas A. Schmitt (1977) — et je crois qu'il a raison — qui proposait de lire Sg 9,18 avec ce qui suit. Ensuite, G. considère que Sg 10 se termine en fait en Sg 11,1, pour la raison que le mot σοφία disparaît dans la suite du livre, sauf en 14,2 (la sagesse artisanale) et 14,5 ("les œuvres de ta Sagesse"). Cet argument suffit-il? J'ai proposé naguère de mettre en continuité Sg 10,1–11,1 et 19,10–22, ensembles constitués l'un et l'autre par des listes. G. trouve ma proposition "accurate and convincing in general" (49), quitte à la rejeter finalement (49-50), mais pour la raison principale qu'il place Sg 10 dans la première partie du livre (50): en logique, cela s'appelle un *latius hos*. Il en arrive tout de même à reconnaître que Sg 10,1–11,1 "is indeed a transitional section" (58), et là encore je suis d'accord, à condition d'en tirer les conséquences. Par ailleurs, recourir à l'idée d'un "nombre d'or", proposée encore par Wright

(1967) ne m'a jamais paru une bonne théorie, que pourtant G. accepte (48). On relèvera enfin l'effort de G. pour caractériser le style de Sg: prose ou poésie? (53-56 et l'*Appendix 1*, 185-195); ce genre d'études n'en est qu'à ses débuts et G. fait avancer la recherche, après la synthèse de C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon* (EtB n.s. 1; Paris 1983) 83-91, que G. connaît (55) sans trop l'apprécier. Bref, à mon avis, G. suit trop Wright. La question qui me reste est de savoir quel sera, selon G., le rapport entre Sg 10,1-11,1 et les chapitres suivants du livre, alors qu'il affirme l'unité de composition du livre.

On en arrive alors à l'étude du genre littéraire de Sg et, en particulier, de Sg 10,1-11,1 dans le contexte que G. lui attribue, à savoir Sg 6-10 (64-101). G. n'échappe pas à la question fondamentale, toujours débattue, du genre littéraire de Sg dans sa totalité. À la suite de J.M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome 1970) 117-121, il maintient que Sg est un protreptique, tandis qu'à la suite de P. Beauchamp, P. Bizzeti, *Il Libro della Sapienza. Struttura e genere letterario* (RivBSup 11; Brescia 1984) 113-180, moi-même dans "Sagesse de Salomon (ou Livre de la Sagesse)", *DBS* 11 (1986) 58-119, spéc. 77-87, et J. Vilchez Líndez, *Sabiduría* (NBE Sapienciales 5; Estella 1990) 38-39, considérons qu'il s'agit d'un *encomium*, d'un éloge à la manière des Grecs. Le vrai problème est de savoir si un discours protreptique peut se conclure par un long développement d'exemples tirés de l'histoire. Les protreptiques antiques qui nous sont parvenus n'en contiennent pas, mais, dira-t-on avec D. Winston, "A Century of Research on the Book of Wisdom", *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (eds. A. Passaro – G. Bellia) (DCLY; Berlin – New York 2005) 5, rien ne prouve qu'ils n'aient pas existé. Pour G., l'auteur de Sg pourrait avoir ajouté à son protreptique la *synkrisis* de Sg 11-19 (69, n. 27). Je note tout de même que Winston (4) admet que "Bizzeti's close analysis considerably advances our understanding of the literary genre of Wis": je préfère cet avis à celui de G. qui se permet d'écrire: "to categorize the entire book as an encomium on Wisdom, as Beauchamp does, is a gross exaggeration" (69) et l'appui que G. pense trouver dans l'article peu convaincant de D. Aune, "Romans as Logos Protrepitkos", *Paulus und das antike Judentum* (eds. M. Hengel – M. Heckel) (WUNT 58; Tübingen 1991) 91-121, n'est pas très solide. Mais peut-être sommes-nous en présence d'une querelle de mots. Je demanderais alors comment appeler les développements historiques qui achèvent quelques traités antiques, comme, par exemple, ceux de Philon, *Quod omnis probus*, 62-136, ou *De nobilitate*, 202-225, texte que G. présente, avec d'autres *Beispielreihen*, dans son *Appendix 2* (208), ou encore celui de Sénèque, *De clementia*, qui donne l'exemple d'Auguste. Il serait bon aussi de relire les théories des Anciens sur l'épidictique (cf. Bizzeti, *Il Libro*, 126-140, et mon article "Sagesse", 80-83). Curieusement, G. considère Sg 6-10 comme un *encomium* (82-89), quitte à

avouer que “chapter 10 [...] was added later to supplement and serve as a transition to the next section” (89). Où est alors l’unité du livre au niveau de sa composition et, plus encore, au plan d’une pensée cohérente? L’hypothèse de Beauchamp n’a pas besoin de ces subterfuges de G.

Le chapitre 5 (102-148) est consacré à l’exégèse des cinq strophes de Sg 10,1-11,1, à savoir 10,1-5.6-9.10-12.13-14.15-11,1, le tout étant précédé d’un bref relevé de la littérature hellénistique et d’un autre sur Isis, en particulier dans son rapport à la Sagesse en Sg 10. Pour le dire tout net, G. donne une bonne exégèse de ces strophes et ses pages sont franchement très acceptables. Je ne relève ici que quelques notes de lecture. À propos de la solitude d’Adam (Sg 10,1b), j’aurais aimé une réaction à l’article de P. Beauchamp, “Épouser la Sagesse – ou n’épouser qu’elle? Une énigme du Livre de la Sagesse”, *La Sagesse de l’Ancien Testament* (ed. M. Gilbert) (BETL 51; Leuven 1979, <sup>2</sup>1990) 347-369, spéc. 360-369 (III. Adam seul avec la Sagesse). En outre, ne peut-on voir dans l’Adam de Sg 10,1 l’Adam primordial auquel quelques textes font allusion (Jb 15,7-8; Sir 49,16b; 1QS 4,22.23; CD-A 3,20 et 1QH<sup>a</sup> 4,15; cf. E. Noffke, “Man of Glory or First Sinner? Adam in the Book of Sirach”, *ZAW* 119 (2007) 618-624? Sur Sg 10,5, on verra à présent l’article de L. Mazzinghi, “La figura di Abramo in Sap 10,5: una rilettura della Scrittura tra giudaismo e ellenismo”, *Sophia – Paideia. Sapienza e educazione* (Sir 1,27). FS M. Cimosà (eds. G. Bonney – R. Vicent) (Roma 2012) 351-364. La γυνῶσις ἁγίων dont bénéficia Jacob à Béthel a été diversement interprétée et G. résume bien le problème; il montre aussi que sa traduction “of holy things”, assez classique, n’exclut aucune des interprétations les plus courantes de ce passage.

Le chapitre 6 (149-179) est le plus original et il apporte, me semble-t-il, des nouveautés fort utiles pour comprendre Sg 10. G. montre, en effet, comment l’auteur de Sg interprète les textes bibliques antérieurs auxquels il se réfère. Pour ce faire, G. retient quatre domaines: 1. le vocabulaire et l’imagerie; 2. les détails sélectionnés par l’auteur de Sg; 3. l’arrangement des épisodes propre à l’auteur de Sg; 4. l’application à son auditoire, ou l’actualisation du texte biblique antérieur (149-158). Puis il compare l’utilisation de ces procédés en Sg 10 avec leur utilisation dans les autres parties du livre: Sg 1,1-6,21; 6,22-9,18; 11,2-19,22 (159-177). On retiendra surtout que partout les personnages sont présentés comme des types idéalisés, soit des justes, soit des impies, sans les nuances qu’apporte, en particulier, le Pentateuque. En outre, l’actualisation, déjà présente en Sg 10,7, se retrouve en 18,8 (170-171), mais G. ne mentionne pas Sg 19,22, texte pourtant capital, puisqu’il clôt le livre. Je relève encore quelques points sur lesquels G. aurait pu être plus nuancé. Comme le pluriel de βασιλεύς en Sg 10,16b se lit non seulement au Ps 104,30 LXX, mais encore en Sir 45,3, G. considère que le livre du Siracide était, pour l’auteur de Sg, “authoritative” (153-154); c’est aller trop vite en besogne, car je ne pense pas qu’on

puisse prouver que l'auteur de Sg ait utilisé le Siracide. Parmi les citations bibliques implicites en Sg 1–6, il faut ajouter Pr 1,7d repris en Sg 3,11a (160). Par contre, la solitude d'Adam, en Sg 10,1b, reçoit une explication qui se rapproche de celle de Beauchamp (155). En Sg 10, on ne trouve aucune allusion aux alliances avec Noé, Abraham et Moïse et G. explique fort bien qu'un sage universalise (156). Enfin, à propos de Sg 19,18 et de la comparaison avec la musique, on verra aussi les pages de R. Pistone, "The Lyre and the Creation. Music Theory and Persuasive Strategy in Wisdom 19", *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research*, 195-217.

G. donne donc une analyse précise de Sg 10,1–11,1 qui nous manquait encore. Mes objections ne visent que ses pages sur la structure et le genre littéraire du livre pris dans sa totalité (39-43, 47-53 et 66-73). Il me paraît aussi que ces pages relèvent du proverbe: "Qui trop embrasse mal étreint": elles ne sont pas absolument nécessaires à l'étude précise de Sg 10, étude qui, elle, est excellente et ne manquera pas d'être retenue.

Avenue Gaston Diderich, 25  
L - 1420 Luxembourg

Maurice GILBERT



## Novum Testamentum

Matthew S. RINDGE, *Jesus' Parable of the Rich Fool*. Luke 12:13-34 among Ancient Conversations on Death and Possessions (Early Christianity and its Literature 6). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2011. xix-299 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

In this revised version of the doctoral dissertation he completed in 2008 at Emory University under the direction of Gail O'Day, Rindge argues that the Parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12,16-21) should be viewed as an integral part of a larger "sapiential narrative" whose principal concerns are at once existential, ethical, and theological: to expose the folly of any attempt to retain control of material goods for selfish ends, and to promote, instead, the giving of alms as a meaningful action that not only brings benefit to others but also enhances the relational life of the giver and thereby renders that person rich toward God.

In the first chapter, R. situates his study within the history of scholarship. He points out that the traditional reading of this parable as a fairly uncomplicated "example story" (*Beispielerszählung*) that warns against the dangers of avarice has given way in recent years to new interpretations based on perceived affinities between the Lucan parable and parallel texts selected either from the treatises of Greco-Roman moralists (as proposed by F. Danker, A. Malherbe, and R. Hock), or from the sapiential writings of various Jewish authors (as suggested by G. Eichholz, E. Seng, and B. B. Scott). While endorsing the validity of this comparative approach, R. insists that prior scholarship has failed to recognize the truly distinctive feature of the parable, which also provides the key to its interpretation: the interplay between death and the proper use of possessions as made explicit in the divine intervention of v. 20. This claim provides the basis for a new reading strategy that situates the Lucan parable in the context of other ancient writings in which reflections on human mortality are combined with recommendations about the proper and meaningful use of material possessions.

In the next three chapters, R. examines a series of Jewish and Hellenistic texts that he considers especially relevant and illuminating. Special attention is given to certain passages in the writings of Qoheleth and Ben Sira (chap. 2). While both authors hold a similar perception of death as an inevitable and yet unpredictable event, they come to sharply divergent conclusions about the proper use of possessions. Faced with the disturbing fact that all human beings, just and unjust, must suffer in death the same total loss of existence, Qoheleth recommends that the one meaningful option is to enjoy in the present those goods that one has received as divine gifts. In contrast, Ben Sira's belief that a person's ultimate fate is determined by the moral choices made in life prompts him to offer more

constructive options for the use of possessions: material goods are valued as divine gifts, to be received with gratitude, to be enjoyed with moderation, and to be shared generously with the poor (through the giving of alms) and with one's rightful heirs (through the making of a will). The conclusions drawn from the reading of Qoheleth and Ben Sira are then used as a lens for discerning and assessing related concerns resident in *1 Enoch* and the *Testament of Abraham* (chap. 3) and in selected writings of Lucian of Samosata and Seneca (chap. 4). For the author of *1 Enoch*, according to R., death represents the passage to a postmortem judgment in which the law of retribution is strictly upheld. In the moral exhortations that follow, material wealth is viewed not as a divine blessing to be enjoyed and shared with others but as the unfailing source of culpable moral corruption. In the *Testament of Abraham*, R. argues, the author offers in the narrative portrayal of Abraham an exemplary model of the virtuous person whose generosity in offering hospitality to strangers and in providing for his heirs secures the blessing of God's favor, in life and in death. In the writings of Lucian and Seneca, on the other hand, references to the fear and anxiety commonly provoked by the prospect of death lead to reflections not so much on the meaningful use of possessions but rather on the need to cultivate an interior freedom by avoiding excessive attachment to material goods. While the stated goal of these chapters is to expound, through "an inductive close reading" of the text (45), the principal concerns of each author, R.'s investigation is clearly guided by an *a priori* interest in presenting the authors as participants in what he considers to be a continuous and cross-cultural "conversation" regarding the interplay of death and possessions.

In chap. 5, R. takes up the task of interpreting the Parable of the Rich Fool in light of the evidence uncovered in the preceding investigation of parallel texts. On the basis of the similarities and differences that emerge from his comparative analysis, R. concludes that the parable participates in this larger sapiential conversation by offering the depiction of a man with a "limited imagination" (194) who ignores all the common recommendations regarding the proper use of possessions. In devising a plan for the future that disregards his own mortality and that fails to consider his material goods as divine gifts to be enjoyed in the present, or to be passed on to rightful heirs, or to be shared generously with those in need, the rich man displays a "folly" that is promptly confirmed and censured by the divine voice. Rindge then adopts a more literary approach in chap. 6, where he examines the immediate literary context in search of further indications of how Luke intends the parable to be understood. Special emphasis is given to the explicit warning against avarice in v. 15, which not only concludes Jesus' response to the request for help in resolving a disputed inheritance but also prepares the way for understanding the parable that follows as a narrative illustration of the same moral admonition. Of even

greater importance, according to R., is the apparently transitional statement in v. 21, which evaluates the rich man's folly in theological terms ("not rich toward God") and thereby sets the stage for the presentation in vv. 22-34 of Jesus' new, God-centered wisdom. The parable, therefore, is framed by two verses that help to clarify its intended function within the surrounding narrative. In contrast with the folly of trying to secure an inheritance (vv. 13-15) or of seeking to accumulate an abundance of material goods for some future enjoyment (vv. 16-21), Jesus proposes a radical alternative: a trustful imitation of God's provident generosity (vv. 22-31) in the concrete act of selling one's possessions and giving alms to the poor (vv. 32-34). The discussion continues in chap. 7 with a study of two ways in which Luke also reconfigures the sapiential conversation regarding death and possessions. First, the depiction of the man's justly acquired surplus serves to broaden the rhetorical impact of the parable. Second, anxiety about the future is introduced as the key existential problem at the root of all futile attempts to control one's life and possessions. In response, Jesus proposes as the only effective solution a greater trust in God's providence, actualized in specific acts of generosity and service. In chap. 9, a comparison with the much simpler version of the parable in *Gospel of Thomas* 63 provides further evidence to confirm the distinctive formulation and contextualization of the Lucan parable. At the very end, R. gives a brief summary of his conclusions and then makes a final appeal for a new approach to the study of Lucan parables that gives greater attention to their sapiential character and rhetorical function. An extensive bibliography is included, along with indices of ancient sources and modern authors.

While many will consider largely successful R.'s efforts to offer a "more textured and nuanced" (42, 230, 240) interpretation of this parable, some of the conclusions reached through the proposed reading strategy will not fail to provoke certain valid reservations. More convincing are the results of R.'s literary analysis of the parable within its immediate context. Of particular value is the insightful discussion of vv. 22-34 as a sapiential discourse that comments on the meaning of the preceding parable (203-209). As for the further attempt to read the parable in concert with a larger sapiential conversation, many unresolved ambiguities place in doubt the validity of this approach. The heuristic notion of a "conversation" is problematic in this case, since the textual evidence, by R.'s own admission (79, 93-34, 161), gives no clear indication of a conversational give and take, or hearing and response, on the part of the authors concerned. Furthermore, it is very difficult to accept as valid R.'s reconstruction of the central issue allegedly addressed in the selected parallels. None of the authors, with the possible exception of Qoheleth, offers anything close to a reflection on the inevitability and uncertain timing of death as the basis for recommendations concerning the proper use of possessions. In the case of 1 Enoch, for example, it is not the uncertainties of life and

death but the certainty of a postmortem judgment that provokes the author's ethical exhortations. The coincidence in the same text of references to death and to the proper use of possessions does not, in itself, imply that the author is making some logical or existential connection between these two concerns, and R.'s analysis of the selected texts, although carefully researched and thoughtfully considered, fails to uncover sufficient evidence to support his hypothesis of a conversation among ancient authors about the interplay of death and possessions. It may be added that the exegetical discussion in the second half of the book does not always follow an orderly progression. The study of the parable in light of external parallels in chap. 5 includes a discussion of the parable's literary context that anticipates the reading strategy to be employed in chap. 6. Likewise, chap. 6 includes at the end a treatment of evidence from parallel texts, which properly belongs in chap. 5. These critical remarks notwithstanding, the author is to be commended for having advanced our understanding of this Lucan parable with a study that examines rigorously and creatively those features of the text that invite a potentially fruitful comparison with the Jewish and pagan literatures of the time.

Via della Pilotta 25  
I – 00187 Roma

Dean BÉCHARD

Ben WITHERINGTON III, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011. xxix-321 p. 16 × 23,5. \$ 38.00 – £ 25.99

Ben Witherington, qui enseigne à l'Asbury Theological Seminary à Wilmore dans le Kentucky, s'est spécialisé dans l'analyse socio-rhétorique (qui, comme son nom l'indique, joint les méthodes de l'histoire sociale et celles de l'analyse rhétorique) et après des commentaires sur les Actes, sur les épîtres aux Galates, aux Thessaloniciens et aux Romains, il propose ici une lecture de l'épître aux Philippiens.

L'introduction à son commentaire donne clairement le cadre dans lequel il entend travailler. Il commence par réfuter l'opinion, devenue de règle depuis une quarantaine d'années, selon laquelle la lettre proviendrait d'une captivité à Éphèse (9-11). Arguant en effet qu'une telle captivité n'est pas documentée, que Paul ne dit pas être en prison mais dans les chaînes (ce qui suggère qu'il était enchaîné à un soldat ou assigné à résidence), que la mention des οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (Ph 4,22) n'est vraisemblable qu'à Rome, que la collecte qui semble être l'obsession de Paul lors de son séjour éphésien a disparu de ses préoccupations, il renoue avec l'option traditionnelle d'une épître de captivité romaine, qu'il date de 62.

Ensuite, se fondant sur l'unité de ton et la continuité des arguments de la lettre, il réfute toutes les théories de partition de la lettre. Une série d'arguments empruntés à la critique textuelle renforce l'argument: l'absence de toute variante textuelle significative, qui implique une grande unité de transmission; l'existence du P<sup>46</sup> qui suggère qu'à une haute époque le texte était d'une seule venue; l'absence d'allusions patristiques tendant à penser qu'il y aurait eu plus d'une lettre en circulation.

En outre, revenant sur son analyse précédente (développée dans son commentaire *Friendship and Finances in Philippi : The Letter of Paul to the Philippians* [NT in Context Commentaries; London 1994]), il démontre que l'écrit ne ressortit pas au genre de la lettre philophonétique (ou lettre d'amitié, *friendship letter*) qui a pour but d'unir un supérieur à un groupe d'inférieurs très souvent dans le but de les consoler, mais bien à la lettre familière (*family letter*) qui unit des personnes de statut équivalent. En effet, on peut remarquer l'absence totale du langage de l'amitié (φίλος ou φίλια) alors qu'abondent les termes qui suggèrent la réciprocité (17-21). Cela n'exclut pas l'usage de la rhétorique: Ben Witherington caractérise la lettre de «discours délibératif avec des traits épideictiques» (25). Pour lui, elle était destinée à être lue à la communauté, et valait donc comme discours.

Enfin, Witherington développe sa théorie sociologique, tournant autour du concept d'identité sociale. Il distingue ainsi entre une identité sociale primaire (fondée sur l'origine géographique ou l'extraction) qui ne change pas au cours de la vie et une identité sociale secondaire modelée au cours des conversions qui peut recouvrir l'identité primaire. Paul possède, selon lui, l'identité primaire d'être juif de Tarse, et l'identité secondaire d'être «en Christ». Sans faire mine de s'en apercevoir (même s'il parle du *parting of the Ways* montrant qu'il sait parfaitement ce qu'il fait), il prend ici une option historique extrêmement forte en estimant que Paul et sa communauté sont plus «chrétiens» que juifs ou païens. Il peut donc conclure: *Well before Paul wrote Philippians, Christian already has a distinguishable new social identity, distinguishable from those of both Jews and Pagans [...]. This theory has much promise to help us understand the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, and how Paul in Philippians is helping his converts make their secondary identity in Christ their primary identity* (35).

Fort de cette certitude, Witherington fait alors un nouveau pas, qui mériterait, lui aussi, qu'on en discute. Remarquant en effet qu'il n'y a quasiment aucune référence à l'Ancien Testament dans la lettre, il en conclut que ses destinataires ne sont pas juifs. Non seulement son commentaire dément cette assertion puisqu'il se sert très largement d'Isaïe et des écrits intertestamentaires pour commenter l'hymne du chapitre 2, mais affirmer que l'absence de référence juive signe à tout coup une audience païenne demande à être démontré. Peut-on dire que *Joseph et Aséneth* qui ne fait quasiment aucune référence au contexte juif était destiné à un lec-

torat de non-juifs? Et que dire de toute la littérature sapientielle, qui ne fait pas plus référence à la Torah que Philippiens?

Le soi-disant paganisme de la communauté de Philippes étant acquis, Witherington peut développer l'axe de lecture de son commentaire: Paul qui, comme chacun sait, se fait tout à tous, n'argumente pas à partir des cadres juifs, mais parle «à la romaine», en utilisant des concepts purement latins, afin de se concilier la communauté d'une ville qui avait le statut de colonie et qui était même «une miniature de Rome» (5). Ainsi est justifiée l'utilisation de la rhétorique pour appuyer le propos de Paul et l'appel extensif que fait Witherington aux réalités sociales *romaines*. Il pourra ainsi, par la suite, expliquer les déclarations de Paul du chapitre 3 non pas comme une polémique intra-juive sur la circoncision, mais bien comme un abandon un peu opportuniste de la pratique légale: Paul s'en serait plus ou moins débarrassé pour éviter de heurter les sensibilités gréco-romaines de ses auditeurs pour qui se faire circoncire équivalait à une castration (194).

Le plan qu'il suit pour commenter la lettre est fondé sur son analyse rhétorique. Après la suscription épistolaire (1,1-2) et l'exorde (1,3-11), il distingue les temps classiques de la rhétorique délibérative. La *narratio* (1,12-26) décrit le progrès de la proclamation de l'Évangile. La *propositio*, ou thèse du discours (1,27-30), est l'appel à vivre une vie digne de cet Évangile. La *probatio* (2,1-4,3) se fait grâce à quatre arguments qui sont quatre modèles à imiter: le premier est le Christ (2,1-18, on reconnaît le fameux hymne); le second est le modèle du partenariat qu'entretient l'apôtre avec sa communauté (2,19-30); le troisième est l'exemple de Paul (3,1-4,1) et enfin le quatrième est le modèle des leaders de la communauté (4,2-3). La *peroratio* (4,4-9) exalte la vertu et la joie en Jésus. Les versets 4,10-20 n'entrent pas dans cette *dispositio*, aussi Witherington les qualifie-t-il de *post-scriptum* en les titrant «Donner et recevoir». Enfin viennent les salutations finales (4,21-23).

Il est impossible de résumer un commentaire. Notons simplement que Witherington reprend la pratique mise en œuvre dans les commentaires précédents d'intercaler des parenthèses intitulées *a closer look* pour examiner les éléments clés du monde gréco-romain: on notera ainsi une sorte de portrait de Timothée, «bras droit» de Paul (43-50), un état de l'art sur l'hymne aux Philippiens (132-164) ou une intéressante comparaison entre la morale paulinienne et la morale antique (249-259). De même, sous le titre *bridging the horizons* l'auteur offre de fréquentes actualisations des propos de Paul destinées à «combler les horizons» c'est-à-dire à faire de la pastorale: Ph 1,27-20 sert à réfléchir sur le 11 septembre 2001 (107-109), des idées pour la prédication sont suggérées (voir par exemple page 68: *Certainly it is true that a whole series of good sermons could be derived from a detailed study of how Paul uses the language of joy, especially here in Philippians.*).

Pour conclure, on notera que l'intérêt de la lecture de Witherington est sa cohérence méthodologique. En partant de l'analyse sociologique et des

*realia* historiques, l'auteur propose une grille de lecture homogène. Bien entendu, celle-ci est plus à l'aise dans certains passages que dans d'autres. On relèvera ainsi l'intéressante discussion sur 4,10-20 dans lequel Paul, gêné d'inscrire le don qu'il a reçu des Philippiens dans une relation patron-client (dans laquelle il serait le client...) propose un autre modèle, fondé sur les relations familiales. On relèvera en revanche que l'analyse peine à commenter l'hymne du chapitre 2: le passage, très théologique, résiste ... Délaissant alors un temps sa manière habituelle, le commentateur se raccroche alors aux Pères qu'il ne cite quasiment pas par ailleurs: Marius Victorinus, Jean Chrysostome, Augustin, Cyrille d'Alexandrie sont promptement convoqués lorsqu'il s'agit d'élucider les difficultés.

Faculté de Théologie  
B-1340 Louvain-la-Neuve

Régis BURNET

Eun-Geol LYU, *Sünde und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus*. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zum paulinischen Sündenverständnis aus soteriologischer Sicht (WUNT II, 318), Mohr Siebeck, 2011. xv-405 p. 15 × 23. €84

The Korean author of this study has been professor in New Testament theology at the Hoseo University in Cheonan (South Korea) since 2010. This book is a somewhat abbreviated and reworked version of his dissertation which was accepted at the Ruprecht-Karls Universität of Heidelberg in 2007.

After the introductory chapters which consist of a brief overview of authors who deal with Paul's conception of sin (beginning with P. Wernle in 1917 and ending with T.L. Carter in 2002), as well as an analysis of the conception of sin in the Old Testament and Greek tradition, the work contains three major parts: I. Sin and Paul's theology of expiation ("Sühnungstheologie"), II. Sin and Paul's theology of 'not-reckoning' ("Nichtanrechnungstheologie": sin is not reckoned as sin), and III. Sin and Paul's theology of liberation or of setting free ("Befreiungstheologie"). A final chapter resumes the central position in Paul's theology of sin and justification and also briefly discusses other soteriological metaphors such as reconciliation and participation. An extended bibliography and three indices ("Stellenregister", authors, and "Sachregister") appropriately close the book.

In Part I Lyu distinguishes between the 'diachronic' Paul and his 'synchronic' letters. According to Lyu, the historical critical method, which is used in gospel studies to separate redaction from tradition, can hardly be applied to Paul's letters. Lyu is therefore constrained to invent a different method of 'inner criteria' in order to detect and distinguish the pre-Pauline and Pauline original kerygma, the "Protokerygma" (ch. 4). Strictly speaking Jesus' death is not a cultic sacrifice nor is it simply a substitute vicarious death. Yet already before Paul, Jesus' death was understood as an



expiation: Christ died for our sins (ch. 5). Although the expression 'righteousness of God' is known before Paul, the interpretation of Jesus' death as 'God's justification of sinners' is genuinely Pauline (ch. 6). Unlike the Jews who through the law knew sin, the Gentiles, through their conscience, also realized their sinfulness and the need of expiation (ch. 7). Lyu is then able to reconstruct the nucleus of the Pauline protokerygma valid for both Jews and Gentiles: through Jesus' death God justified sinners. God's wrath, the basic condition of faith, and the promise of eternal life for believers constitute a "Sühnungstheologie" (ch. 8).

In Part II Lyu first examines the historical place of Paul's critical position over against the law. Already in the Pauline protokerygma the law had lost its supreme importance (ch. 9). Yet only in the letter to the Galatians does it become evident that the conflict with the Galatian opponents brought Paul to develop his critical position on the law. Justification comes through faith in Christ, not through the works of the law. The law cannot save; it only brings the knowledge of sin (ch. 10). Many pages of this book are devoted to Paul's "Gesetzespolemik", resulting in the exegesis first of a number of passages of Galatians, then of numerous sections of the Letter to the Romans. Lyu calls Paul's new conviction his "Nicht-anrechnungstheologie" (ch. 11). As a conclusion of this second Part, Lyu critically analyses how "the New Perspective on Paul" evaluates boasting, the law and sin. Good insights of this new perspective should not, however, overlook the fact that it neglects to recognize the sinfulness of the Gentiles as the foundation of the early Christian mission (ch. 12).

In Part III Lyu considers the personification of sin by Paul. He begins by demonstrating that this personification is at home only in Romans. It functions as an answer to a double misunderstanding, first of Paul's theology of expiation (the more sin, the more forgiving grace), second of his not-reckoning theology (law is radically overthrown by faith) (ch. 13). Personified sin enslaves the sinners; only the Spirit can set them free (see Romans 8). Paul sets the victorious dominion of justification over against the dominion of sin (see Rom 5,14-21). Over against the enslavement to sin, Paul places the new reality of being slaves to righteousness through grace (see Rom 6,6b-23). Only the Spirit can again set free those Christians who want to save themselves through works of the law and thus find themselves in a hopeless situation (see Romans 7) (ch. 14). The synchronic letter to the Romans thus enables us to see the diachronic way Paul's theology of justification of sinners eventually followed: from the theology of expiation to the not-reckoning theology with its criticism of legalism, to the theology of setting free from enslaving sin in order to refute a double misunderstanding (ch. 15).

The numerous qualities of this dissertation should be recognized and duly mentioned. Lyu applies his methodological approach quite logically: first putting forward an insight, which then is proved by close exegetical

discussions and, finally, resumed in a clear conclusion (“Fazit”). We have before us a solid and impressive piece of work; a great number of Pauline texts are thoroughly explained. Moreover, the main thesis of the author appears to be correct. Paul begins his theology by his conviction that all, Jews alike with Gentiles, are sinners and therefore in need of forgiveness and expiation. Paul refers to this process in his own specific way: “The justification of the sinner by faith”.

My critical remarks will be limited to three major considerations. The first question touches the title of Part II: “Nichtanrechnungstheologie”. Only here, not in Part I nor Part III, is the chosen title negative. Why? The meaning is that sins are not reckoned; this means that they are not taken into account and are forgiven. By this not-reckoning theology Paul explains further his theology of expiation (Part I) and defines it more precisely. However, the only passage in Paul’s letters where this mode of expression is used, Rom 4,8, is part of the citation of Ps 31,1-2 which speaks of the sins of David: “Blessed is the one to whom the Lord will not reckon sin” (the deponent verb *logizètai*, moreover, is active in meaning). This manner of speaking is hardly typical for Paul. Would a title that is derived from “God justifies the sinner by faith, not by works of the law” (Gal 2,16; cf. Rom 3,19) not have been preferable?

It is unfortunate that the discussion of Gal 2,15 does not treat this verse as part of Paul’s discourse which begins in 2,14b and ends with 2,21 (see 189-192). For Lyu, incorrectly it would seem, 2,15 is a nominal clause and refers to the position of the Galatian opponents. It is not part of the lengthy sentence which continues in v. 16. Therefore, according to him, verse 15 should not be understood concessively: “Although it is true that we are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners”. The emphatic “we” at the beginning does not point to Paul and Peter (cf. however v. 14b). The connection with the Antioch incident (1,11-14a) is, I think, not taken into account sufficiently. It should be noted, however, that Lyu’s interpretation of *dia nomou* in 2,19 may be correct: “because of (not observing the whole of) the law” (see 103-104).

Perhaps one of the most problematic items in this book is Lyu’s explanation of Romans 7, not so much in the conclusion that the “I” of 7,8-25 refers to Christians as in the way that he defends this understanding (see 322-331). In his discussion there is no mention of 7:5, a verse that precedes almost immediately the “I”-passage and clearly deals with the pre-Christian situation. Furthermore one can hardly agree with the author’s view that the “I” passage begins with 7,8, not with 7,7. It is also difficult to understand how the Adam story, definitely present as the background of 7,8, cannot explain 7,9: “I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin (= the serpent) revived”. An application to the pre-Christian situation occurs as it were automatically. Lyu’s interpretation that the coming of the commandment indicates how the “I” shows “einen Christen vor

seinem Wandel im Geist" (331) and how this Christian considers the law again as needed for salvation is hardly convincing.

More critical questions could be raised concerning, e.g., Lyu's negative exegesis of Rom 2,14-16 (see 235) or his claim that for the Galatian opponents circumcision (a "Kulthandlung) and Jesus' "Sühnetod" are closely connected (see 189-199 and 208). Yet notwithstanding my serious and manifold disagreements in detail, this study, I think, should be considered as a sound defence of Paul's "Sühnungstheologie" with general sinfulness as its anthropological "Kernpunkt".

Waversebaan, 220  
B-3001Leuven (Heverlee)

Jan LAMBRECHT

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Tutti i libri o i fascicoli che vengono inviati alla Direzione appaiono in questo elenco. Il fatto che vi figurino non implica alcun giudizio su di essi. Recensioni più ampie dei libri verranno fatte secondo il parere del Redattore.

I libri inviati alla Direzione che non sono stati chiesti direttamente per recensione non si restituiscono in nessun caso, anche se non potranno essere recensiti. Tutti i libri insieme con gli estratti di articoli inviati alla Direzione vengono trasmessi all'Editore dell' *Elenchus of Biblica* e vi appariranno secondo il giudizio dell'Editore.

I libri vanno inviati alla Direzione di *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Via della Pilotta, 25 – I-00187 Roma.

**Utzschneider**, Helmut, *Exodus 1–15* (Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2012. 372 p. 17,5 × 24,5. €69.90

**Wanke**, Roger Marcel, *Praesentia Dei*. Die Vorstellungen von der Gegenwart Gottes im Hiobbuch (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 421). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2013. xii-480 p. 16 × 23,5. €159,95

**Webb**, Robert L. – **Watson**, Duane F. (eds.), *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes*. Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Second Peter (Library of New Testament Studies 382). London – New York, T & T Clark, 2010. xviii-201 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £70.00

**Wilson**, Walter T., *The Sentences of Sextus* (Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 1). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. xiv-478 p. 15,5 × 23

**Witherington**, Ben III, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011. xxix-321 p. 16 × 23,5. \$38.00 – £25.99

**Yamazaki-Ransom**, Kazuhiko, *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative* (Library of New Testament Studies 353). London – New York, T & T Clark, 2010. xv-440 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £70.00

**Yona**, Shamir – **Hurowitz**, Victor Avigdor (eds.), *Wisdom, Her Pillars are Seven*. Studies in Biblical, Post-Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Wisdom Literature (Beer-Sheva 20). *S.l.*, Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2011. xiii-139 p. 17,5 × 24,5

**Young**, Robb Andrew, *Hezekiah in History and Tradition* (VTS 155). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2012. xvii-367 p. 16 × 24,5. €128 – \$175.00

**Zabán**, Bálint Károly, *The Pillar Function of the Speeches of Wisdom*. Proverbs 1:20–33, 8:1–36 and 9:1–6 in the Structural Framework of Proverbs 1–9 (BZAW 429). Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter, 2012. xxiv-377 p. 16 × 23,5. €119,95